John Cumming

A TREATISE OF THE TRVE NATVRE AND DEFINITION of iuſtifying faith;

TOGETHER WITH A DEFENCE of the ſame, againſt the Anſwere of *N. Baxter.*

By IOHN DOWNE B. in Divinity, and ſometime *Fellow of* EMANVEL *C. in Cambridge.*

AVGVST. DE SPIR. ET LIT. CAP. 30.

Lex dicit, non concupiſces; Fides dicit, Sana animam meam, quoniam peccavi tibi; Gratia dicit, Ecce ſanus factus es, jam noli peccare, ne quid tibi deterius contingat; Sanitas dicit, Domine Deus meus, clamavi ad te & ſanâſti me; Liberum arbitrium dicit, voluntariè ſacrificabo tibi; Dilectio juſtitiæ dicit, narraverunt mihi iniuſti delectationes, ſed non ſicut Lex tua Domine.

The Law ſaith, thou ſhalt not covet; Faith ſaith, heale my ſoule, for I haue ſinned againſt thee; Grace ſaith, lo thou art made whole, ſin no more leaſt a worſe thing befall thee: Health ſaith, O Lord my God, I haue cried vnto thee and thou haſt healed mee; Free-will ſaith, I will freely ſacrifice vnto thee; Loue of iuſtice ſaith, the wicked haue ſhewed mee delights, but not according to thy law O Lord.

OXFORD,

Printed by IOHN LICHFIELD for *Edward Forreſt.* 1635.

TO THE READER.

IT is now somewhat vpward of two yeares, since passing through the City of Bristol towards the Vniuersity of Cambridge, I was by the importunitie of sundry Gittizens, my very good friends, arrested there certaine daies. For no sooner was I there arrived, but presently they repaired vnto me, and like so many Iacobs began to wrestle with me, protesting they would not let me goe vnlesse I first promised to blesse them, and to bestow some spirituall gifts among them. It was no small ioy vnto mee to see the Kingdome of Heaven suffer such violence, and the people of God (like so many thirsty Harts, braying for the rivers of waters,) & paring after the liuing God. Wherefore I could not but with Iacobs Angel giue them leaue to prevaile, & yeeld so farre vnto their earnest request, that being angariated to goe but one mile, I was notwithstanding content to goe with them more then twaine, preaching (before my departure thence) diuers sermons vnto them.

This must be referred to the time whē the Author writ it.

Gen 32.24. 26. Rom. 1.11. Mat. 11.12. Psal. 42.1. Gen. 32. 28. Mat. 5.41.

One time among the rest I chose for my Theme that of S. Paul to the Ephesians, Aboue all take the shield of Faith whereby ye may quench all the fiery darts of that wicked One. Wherein because Iustifying Faith seemed to be commended as the principallest peece of the Christians Panoplie, & of surest proofe against all the assaults & temptations

Ephes. 6.16.

tions of Satan, I held it neceſſary with all diligence to enquire what might be the true nature and definition thereof, and at length I reſolued that the Act thereof was not Aſſurance but Affiance, the Subiect not the vnderſtanding, but the will; and the Obiect not preſent grace and future glory, but the perſon of the Mediator. So that I defined it, not as vulgarly it is conceiued, An aſſurance that we are already iuſtified and ſhall be ſaued: but thus, An affiance vpon Chriſt the Mediator for iuſtification and conſequently Saluation. The occaſio mouing me to intreat of this argument was this. A certaine graue and godly Matrone of that City hauing beene a long time ſore afflicted with ſickneſſe both in mind and body, I went vpon entreaty with other friends to viſit her; and after mutuall ſalutation, Siſter quoth I vnto her, were I Phyſitian for the body, I would aduiſe you the beſt I could for the health thereof: but it is not my element, and therefore I may not without great raſhneſſe put my ſelfe in to it: neuertheleſſe if you ſhall pleaſe to diſcouer vnto me the wound of your ſpirit, happily I may apply ſuch a ſalue thereunto, as by the bleſſing of God may cloſe it vp, or at leaſt giue ſome reſocillation and eaſe vnto the anguiſh thereof. My wound then, quoth ſhe, in a word is this: I want faith. And what may be the ground, quoth I, of this perſwaſion? Becauſe, quoth ſhe, I am not aſſured that I am iuſtified and ſhall be ſaued. A weake ground, quoth I, ſeeing a man may haue Faith that wanteth ſuch Aſſurance; how may that be, quoth ſhe? for as hitherto I haue beene taught, Faith is no other then Aſſurance. Then haue you beene taught amiſſe, quoth I: and if this be all the ſcruple that troubleth you, I hope ere we part to finiſh the cure. Thereupon I began freely to declare what I conceiued of the true nature of iuſtifying Faith, and proued vnto her by ſundrie remonſtrances that

it was

it was not Assurance *but* Affiance, *and with so good successe, that both she and all that were present rested therewith much comforted and contented. Only they prayed me both for their owne confirmation, and the further information of others, that I would be pleased to speak of it againe in a more publike audience: whereunto (seeing no reason to dissuade me) I readily condescended, and on the text aforesaid handled the matter somewhat largely.*

This Sermon at least so farre as concernes the Definition of Faith was by one Mr Baxter then preacher of that City greatly distasted and disliked: in so much as by message he threatned me with open confutation thereof in the Pulpit, unlesse I gaue him the speedier & better satisfaction: which threatning though I little feared, knowing I had built nor hay nor stubble vpon the foundation, *but such doctrines as were well able* to endure the triall of the fire: *yet because the Apostle chargeth* to be ready alwayes to giue answere to euery man that asketh a reason of the Hope that is in vs, *I was of soones willing the best I could to satisfie him. Being therefore by the mediation of some friends brought to a parle with him, I prayed him to remember that whatsoeuer I spy'd in that Sermon was not barely affirmed but soundly proued, and therefore he might not in reason demaund satisfaction of me vntill himselfe had satisfied my reasons: which if he should substantially doe, I would ease him of his Pulpit-confutation, and the same tongue that broched the arrour, should in the same place againe reuoke it. Then began I to presse him with this argument,* If faith be Assurance, then God commanding a Reprobate to beleeue, commands him also to be assured, *which is absurd. whereunto all his answere was,* who art thou that disputest with God? *I replied, that I neither disputed with God nor controled*

1 Cor. 3. 12. 13.

1 Pet. 3. 15.

Rom. 9. 20.

trolled his actions: but only denyed that God commands a Reprobate to be assured, *for so he should command that to be beleeued for true, which nor is nor euer shall be true. Againe I argued thus,* If Faith be Assurance, then whosoeuer wanteth Assurance wanteth Faith, which to a distressed soule is most vncomfortable. *To this he answered that desire of Assurance is in the acceptation of God as Assurance it selfe. I replyed, that* Mr Perkins *being vrged with the same Obiection answered in the same manner, but vnsufficiently: for if actuall Faith be necessary to iustification, then is actuall Assurance also necessary if Faith be assurance: Here* Mr Baxter *would needs take occasion to expostulate, why I should presume to define otherwise then* Mr Perkins, *and so many worthy Divines had done before mee. Wherevnto I answered roundly and plainely,* Socrates is deare, and Plato is deare, but truth is farre dearer: *and therefore prayed him that leauing to oppose authority vnto reason, and sounding names vnto sound proofes, hee would returne againe within the lists, and either satisfie what I had said, or giue mee leaue to proceed to the rest of my arguments. But for this he craued, at then, to bee excused, pretending vrgent and instant businesse, yet offering to haue our conference adiourned vnto some other day. I told him that the time of absence (limited me from the* Colledge, *whereof I was then Fellow) was almost at an end, so that vnlesse I would hazard my place I might make no longer stay there: neuertheiesse if he pleased I would before my departure giue him my minde in writing, and attend his answere also in writing at his better leisure: To this hee presently condescended, holding it the fittest course, and promising (if I held my word with him) within one Moneth to returne me his full answere. I assured him that for my*

Arist. Eth. l. 1. c. 5.

part

part I would not faile him: and thereupon embracing one the other, and giuing hand that wee would proceed as wee had begun with all peace and loue, we brake off talke at that time and departed. The ſecond day after, according to promiſe, I ſent him the Treatiſe following, Of the true nature & definition of iuſtifying Faith, comprizing therein with ſome addition what ſoeuer touching the matter in queſtion I had more briefly deliuered in the Pulpit: and the next morning taking leaue of my friends, & commending them to the grace of God in Chriſt I ſet forward for Cambridge.

The moneth being expired I looked out for my anſwere: for I could not thinke he would proue a bad pay-maſter, and breake day with me: But a moneth and a moneth and many other moneths followed after their predeceſſor, and all the while not a word from my Antagoniſt: which though in ſome Creditors it would haue bred ſuſpition, yet was I content to lay hold on the better handle, and to ſet the beſt conſtruction I could vpon his ouerlong ſilence, interpreting it as Cicero did his frend Varros forbearance, rather Diligence then Slacknes. For as Zeuxis was the longer in drawing his Pictures, becauſe as he ſaid vnto Agatharchus, he painted vnto Eternity: ſo Mr Baxter perhaps might the more ſlowely come off with his anſwere, that in the meane ſeaſon he might make it the more exact and accurate, it being ſeldome ſeene that the ſame thing is both haſtily and exquiſitely done. But while I was thus ingenuouſly cenſuring his ſilence, and reſoluing yet further to forbeare him, remembring that of Cato, Soone enough if well enough: I receiued certaine aduertiſement that he had erewhile broken ſilence, and diſperſed among his friends a moſt bitter and contumelious Inuectiue againſt me, contrary both to his promiſe that he would proceed with all peace and charity, and

Epiſt. Fam. l. 9. ep. 8.

Sat cito, ſi ſat bene.

and the reputation of learning he ſo much affects, not daring to ſend me a Copy thereof. Loth I was ſeeing I haue not the rule of other mens pens, that others ſhould haue the command of my affections: yet being ſo vrgently & vnſchollerly dealt with all, the next time I paſſed through the City I could not but with ſome indignation challenge him for it to his face: At which time how he faltered and ſtaggered in his tale, now confidently affirming he had by a friend conueyed his anſwer vnto me, & by & by being conteſted by the party, ſhamefully retracting it. Pretending for excuſe the loſſe of my paper, I appeale to them who then both ſaw and heard it. But this I ſay, that as his inconſtancy and diſtraction bewrayed little friendſhip betwixt his heart & tongue, & argued a ſelfe-guiltines of a poore and ſorry Reply: ſo the pretẽced loſſe of my paper was but a ſilly ſhift to delay me for the preſent, and as the euent ſhewes, a miſerable tergiuerſation. For hauing a freſh offered within one moneth to ſend me an anſwere, and thereupon engaged both his credit and ſcholler-ſhip if he were ſupplied with another coppy: although the next day I left one for him vnder my hand, and now not one onely but twelue monthes are ſince fully finiſhed and expired, yet hath he hitherto beene to me ward as ſilent as midnight: to me ward I ſay, for otherwiſe the libell ſtill paſſed vnder hand, and at euery meeting made his diſciples good glee. Whereby it plainly appeareth, his meaning neuer was by an honeſt and chriſtian entercourſe of writing to ſift out the truth: but onely by ſecret pamphletting to diſparage me among his followers, that ſo himſelfe might riſe the higher, in the ballance of their eſtimation. For had he ſincerely and vnfainedly purpoſed the maintenance of Gods truth, and the reformation of my erronious iudgment, would he thus vncharitably haue played his prizes in the dark, and to

mich-

mischiefly haue gone about to steale an opinion of victory: or would he not rather as became a right Champion of truth boldly haue confronted his aduersary in the field, yea though hee had beene armed with no better weapon then a silke sling, as long as he came (for so he pretends) in the name of the Lord of Hosts? But the truth is, pertaining himselfe so farre aduanced into the battell that now without shame and confusion hee might not retreat, hee held it the safest course by writing somewhat to make the world beleeue hee had duly performed with mee, and yet by limiting it vnto the hands of a few of his trustiest friends to deprive mee of all possibility of answering for my selfe, resting assured that my silence would be taken to proceed rather of weakness and insufficiencie in me, then any necessitie by his cunning enforced vpon mee. A new kinde of policie, or of malice rather as Hierome saith vnto Ruffin, to accuse of what you feare to discouer, and to write what you would haue concealed. *And so warie and heedfull hath he been herein, that with all the diligence and endeauour I could vse, I could not for the space of full two twelue moneths be seized of his answer.*

Contra Ruffin. ad Pamm. & Marcell. l. 1. c. 1.

But at length the night-raven fell into the snare, and by the watchfulnesse of my good friends in Bristow *I obtained such a* Copie *thereof as with all his shifts and excuses hee cannot possibly disclaime, being indeed subscribed with his owne hand. Perhaps you may think it found me when I first receiued it, strongly forestalled and possessed with preiudice: and indeed his base and vnworthie dealing deserued no other. For how could I entertaine any indifferent conceit of that whereof the authors selfe seemed to bee ashamed? Nevertheless before I began to pervse it, so farre prevailed I ouer my affections, that I throughly cleered them of all par-*

tialitie and presumption, yea and grew so rigorous & vnequall against my selfe, that I was content to suppose I might be in error, and be happily the Physitian *to cure the disease of my iudgement, resolving if I might plainely be convinced so to take vnto me Christian severity and recant the same. For if I may not hope in this life to aspire to the highest degree of wisdome, yet would I willingly rise to some degree of modesty, that if I may not in all things say that which is not to be repented of, yet I may at least repent me of what I haue said amisse.*

In this temper and disposition I tooke the booke, and casting mine eye vpon the front thereof, there I found it thus inscribed. The answer of Nath. Baxter Bachelor in Divinitie and Warden of new Colledge in Yoghul to the arguments of Mr Io. Downe Bachelor in Divinitie in a controversie of justifying Faith, preached by the said Mr Downe in Bristoll. *Then vnderneath, the Question thus stated* M. Downe; Iustifying Faith is not assurance, persuasion, or firme knowledge of a mans salvatiō in Christ Iesus. M. Baxter; Iustifying Faith is an assurance and knowledge of our salvation in Christ Iesu. *And lastly vnder that againe this passage of* Calvin *vouched*, The Faith of the Gospell is properly called a knowledge of the grace of God: because no man ever tasted of the Gospell but he which knew himselfe reconciled vnto God, and apprehended his salvation offered to him in Christ.

In ad Coloss. c. 1. to. 6.

In the inscription, though it please him in such sort to stile himselfe, I thinke to make the reader beleeue that I had met with my peer at least; and if I were a Bithus, *he were no lesse then a* Bacchius: *yet could he not without great arrogance challenge those titles to himselfe, having never taken such degree in either of the* Universities, *and being no more*

Horat. lib. 1. Sat. 7.

Warden

Warden of Yoghul then was Captaine Stukelie Marques of Ireland, or Robert Venantius in the Counsel of Trent Archbishop of Armach. As touching the Question that also is very defectiuely and imperfectly propounded: for neither doe I maintaine negatiuely alone that Faith is not Assurance, but affirmatiuely also that it is Affiance. neither doth he only affirme contradictorily vnto me that it is Assurance, but further granteth in his Answer that it includeth also my Affiance. And as for the passage of Calvin, to what end it is here prefixed vnlesse it be to preiudicate mee with the greatnesse of his authoritie, I knowe not. But as hee would hold it vnreasonable if another should vrge him therewith in the question of Ecclesiasticall Policie & conformitie, because himselfe is of another minde: so neither hath he any reason to presse the same vpon me in this controuersie wherein I professe my selfe (but with all modestie) to differ from him. These flashings, as it were, and inflammations thus appearing in the very face of his booke, made mee I confesse, somewhat stagger in my former resolution, and to doubt lest they might be symptomes of an vnsound and distempered bodie. Nevertheless I was not so driven from my station but that I easily recovered the same againe. For fearing lest as the Physiognomer was foully deceiued, iudging of Socrates only by his outward Physnomie and countenance, so I also might be as much mistaken if by the front alone I should make an estimate of the whole Answer: I was soone perswaded, yet further to suspend my verdict vntill I had taken a full and thorow survay thereof: Which when I had once done, then indeed began I to be greatly abashed, and vtterly to condemne my selfe of foolish lightnesse and credulity, that could hope so suddenly to gather Grapes of Thornes; or reape other then tares in the field of the envi-

Genuil. exam. Conc. Trid. Sess. 1.

Mat. 7. 16.

ous man. For whereas touching the manner I tooked hee
should haue followed the Apostles counsell, who adviseth to
instruct with meeknesse those that are contrary minded,
2 Tim. 2. 25. if God at any time will giue them repentance to acknow-
ledge the truth: he as if he had to deale, not with a brother
erring of infirmity, but some obstinate Heretike condemned
Tit. 3. 11. of his owne conscience, inflames his affections against me in
as high a degree as was Nabucodonosors furnace, seuen
times hotter then Christian charity could haue made them.
And whereas touching the matter I expected that hee who
stood so much vpō tearmes of scholership, should vse nothing
else but Syllogismes and necessary Demonstrations, that
by pure vertue and fine force he might captiue my reason
vnto the obedience of Faith: he rather like an idle declai-
mer, trusting more to the noise and multitude of his words
then the strength and pregnancy of his reasons, traverseth
aloafe in vnnecessary and impertinent discourses, and puffs
vp his empty Answer with the breath of many frivolous &
vainely affected phrases, gaining perhaps thereby applause
of the vulgar and simple, but from the graue and learned no
better entertainment then the Shepheards whistle. In a
Cic. l. 1. ep. 13. ad Attic. Hist. nat. lib. 12. c. 19. word, as the Troglodytes (of whom Pliny reports) venture
vpon the maine Ocean, without either rudder or oare or
sayle, hauing in their boats nothing but man and boldnesse:
even so my aduersary hazardeth himselfe vpon this deepe
question, and taketh vpon him the Confutation of my Trea-
tise, vsing therein nor naturall reason, nor humanity, nor di-
vinitie, but only impudent facing, and desperate asseuera-
tion.

The consideration of all which, halfe perswaded me at the
first not to vouchsafe it any Replication at all; but without
farther ceremonie to commit it to the mercy of the Moth
or-

or the Grocer. For how could I reply vnto it, but either I must grace it by making it seeme worthy to be confuted, or disgrace my selfe by cõfuting so vnworthy a toy? And what should I reioine vnto it? That which is serious and of importance? I could not, because he giues me no occasion: Reproch for reproch, and slander for slander? I might not, because it is vnchristian: and to answer a foole according to his folly were to proue like vnto him, as Salomon *saith.* Prou. 26. 4. *Howbeit vpon riper aduise and deliberation I held it for sundrie causes if not necessary yet very expedient and fitting to shape him an answer. And first in respect of him, if it may be to expresse his audacious nes, and to let him see that they oftentimes leap too short, who thinke to make anothers impeachement arise for their owne reputation. For if* a foole be not answered according to his folly, he will Prou. 26. 5. *saith* Salomon, waxe wise in his owne conceit. *Then secondly in regard of my owne selfe, and the credit of my Ministery, to wipe away the slanderous aspersions and imputations of I know not what strange opinions and dangerous intentions wrongfullie if not maliciously charged vpon me: lest if I dissemble them I bee thought to confesse them, or to approue them if I refell them not. Thirdly and lastly in regard of others, and among the rest those my good friends especially who occasioned the preaching of this doctrine, partly to preserue from recidiuation such as by the comfortablenesse thereof were reuiued out of great distresse, and partly to preuent others from falling into the like perplexitie. Although therefore I denie not but that good houres bestowed vpon so bad a subiect might haue beene more profitably employed, especially considering that by the violent struggling thereof against the rooke of truth, it hath wholly turned it selfe into froth, and hath not so much as a drop*

of cleere reaſon in it: yet notwithſtanding for the reaſons aforeſaid, and that it may perfectly appeare how ſtedfaſt and vnmoued the rocke ſtands, and how little the ſtormes and tempeſts raiſed againſt it haue preuailed vpon it, I haue thought good to skim away the ſome of Sophiſtrie wrought about it, and to diſcouer the very ground whereon it is ſetled. Which when I ſhall haue done, I doubt not, howſoeuer my aduerſary with his tong-valiantnes and ſwelling words may haue made vnexperienced folke beliue that with the breath of his mouth hee is able to driue whole armies of arguments before him: yet I ſhall approue euen to the iudgement of preiudice it ſelfe that whatſoeuer in this windie & wordie Pamphlet he hath vented againſt me is vainer then vanitie it ſelfe.

And thus, Chriſtian Reader, haue I at length fully acquainted thee with the whole ſtory both of the originall and progreſſe of this controuerſie. Now it remaineth ere thou paſſe thy cenſure and ſentence thereupon, that thou be pleaſed to beſtow a little paines in peruſing our aduerſary writings; and what thou findeſt in them (ſaid or gainſaid) diligently to examine, not by the deceitfull ballance of priuate opinion, but by the publicke beame of the Sanctuarie *euen the* Scriptures *of God. For* mans ſiluer is mingled with
Eſa. 1. 22. droſſe, and his wine is tempered with water, *neither hath he receiued ſuch a meaſure of the Spirit as to know all things, or to be exempted from poſsibility of erring: but*
1 Ioh. 1. 5. God is light and in him is no darkneſſe, *and truth is vnto him ſo neceſſary and eſſentiall as it is impoſsible hee ſhould* either deceiue or be deceiued, *it implying contradiction with his nature. And therefore the priuilege of infallibility belonging vnto him alone, to him alone belongeth alſo the prerogatiue of ſupreme iudicature: ſo that whatſoeuer*

he

he ſaith, is ſimply and abſolutely to bee beleiued, whereas the ſayings of men are by his word to be tried and determined. This I ſay not to impeach the credit or eſtimation of any, only I would reſerue vnto God the Soueraigne authority due vnto him: Which if any preſume to arrogate or claime vnto himſelfe (as indeed the Biſhop *of* Rome *doth vnto his chaire, as if it were made of* Iriſh timber, *and might not endure a ſpider to hang his web thereon) hee is vndoubtedly poſſeſſed with the* Spirit *of* Antichriſtian *pride, and like another* Lucifer *vſurpeth vpon the throne of God. But they* that are led by the Spirit of Chriſt, *and haue beene reputed the worthieſt inſtruments and ornaments in the* Church, *acknowledging holy Writ to be the* Standard of truth, *and the only vnmoued* Principle *into which all* Queſtions of Faith *are finally to bee reſolued, boldly exact the writings of other men thereunto, and meekely ſubmit their owne to be cenſured thereby. Let one* S. Auguſtin *ſpeake for all,* The diſputations of men, *ſaith he,* how Catholicke or laudable ſoeuer, we ought not to eſteeme as Canonicall Scripture, as if it were not lawfull (ſauing the honor due vnto them) to diſallow or reiect any thing in their writings, if happily wee find ought in them ſwarueing from truth. Such am I in the writings of other men, and ſo would I haue others to vnderſtand in mee. *Now therefore, to draw to a concluſion, ſeeing to thy vpright cenſure and arbitrement I referre my ſelfe, and the rule by which thou art to proceed if thou wilt pronounce righteouſly, is as we haue ſhowed, not the opinion of man, but the oracle of God; I muſt entreate thee that laying aſide all reſpect of perſons thou ſuffer not thy ſelfe to bee ſwayed either with the multitude or greatnes of thoſe that are contrary minded, but conferring cauſe with cauſe, and counterpoiſing*

Epiſt. 111. ad Fortunatian.

terpoiſing reaſon againſt reaſon, thou giue thy iudgement of them as the weight of Diuine euidence ſhall incline thee. For otherwiſe, if like a partiall Feſtus, willing to doe the
Act. 25. 9. Iewes a pleaſure, *thou demand of me,* Whither I will goe vp to Ieruſalem and there bee iudged of theſe things before thee: *I muſt roundly and peremptorily anſwer thee*
V. 10. 11. *with S. Paul,* I ſtand at Cæſars barre where I ought to be iudged, to the Iewes I haue done no wrong, neither may any man deliuer me vnto them, I appeale vnto Cæſar: *But if with the ſame* Feſtus *better aduiſed by his Counſell, thou ſay vnto me as hee did vnto* Paul, Haſt thou ap-
V. 12. pealed vnto Cæſar? Vnto Cæſar ſhalt thou goe: *then looke what definitiue ſentence ſoeuer thou ſhalt giue according to* Cæſars *law, I meane the ſacred* Scriptures, *I ſhall as becommeth a ſubiect of the Kingdome humbly ſubmit my ſelfe vnto it, and without further prouocation or appeale quietly and peaceably reſt in it. In the meane ſeaſon I conclude with that holy and deuout prayer of Fulgentius,*
De Prædeſt. to Mon. l. 1. beſeeching the God of all truth, that by his preuenting and purſuing mercy whatſoeuer truths we know which ſauingly are to bee knowne he would teach vs, in thoſe which already we know to be true hee would keepe vs, wherein as men we faile and are deceiued he would correct vs, in what truths we doubt of hee would confirme vs, and from falſe and pernicious errors he would deli-
Eph. 4. 13. uer vs: *that ſo at length* wee may all meet, *as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh,* in the vnity of Faith and knowledge of the Son of God vnto a perfect man, euen to the meaſure of the age of the fulneſſe of Chriſt. Amen.

A TREATISE OF THE TRVE NATVRE AND DEFINITION of iustifying faith,

IF it be true which *Tertullian* sayth, that euen in the very smallest matters regard is to bee had of Truth: surely in those weighty & profound mysteries of Religion wherein errour doth so much hazard soule and saluation, nothing ought more carefully to be respected then the search and finding out of Truth. For as the same Father sayth, *Although Philosophers Player-like affect the truth as being ambitious of glory, yet Christians studiously follow it,* Apol. aduer. Gen. c. 46.

as being carefull of their Saluation. Now among the many excellent and heauenly graces, wherewith the Spirit of God beautifieth and enricheth the hearts of his Elect, there is no one of more either necessity vnto saluation, or importance for comfort and consolation, then that of *Iustifying Faith.* For as by the first Act of this faith, our *Iustification* before God, our peace with God, our incorporation into the mysticall body of Christ Iesus, our conuersion vnto God are first wrought and effected: so by the consequent continued Acts of the same Fayth, are wee (being fallen) dayly renewed, and from both totall and finall falling away safely preserued and maintained. This (cõsidered me-thinkes) no time can be better employed, nor no paines more profitably taken, then in the quest and enquiry of the true nature and definition of *Iustifying Fayth.* And although, I cannot deny but hee may haue fayth who cannot like a Logician define it, and may haue the benefit of Iustification, by it, who cannot distinguish the nature of it: yet this withall I boldly auerre, that the ignorance hereof, or a confused and indistinct apprehension of it, disableth vs both from giuing and taking direct and euident comfort from it, whereas a cleare and distinct knowledge thereof is able to satisfie and replenish with comfort any distressed or afflicted conscience. For this cause haue I vndertaken (so briefly and perspicuously as I can) to set downe my opinion of the definition of Fayth, perswading my selfe I doe not, endeauouring at leastwise not to swarue from the wholesome doctrine of Christ and Gods word. From the writings and doctrine of most learned and worthy Diuines peraduenture it doth, and indeed it doth vary: to whom although as farre [illegible]

inferior

inferior I owe all reſpect & reuerence, yet being Gods freeman I cannot endure to bee mans bond-man and ſweare to all they ſay. One *Paphnutius* ſometime in the matter of Prieſts marriage preuailed againſt a whole Counſell of moſt learned and godly Biſhops: and young *Elihu* may ſpeake more oportunely & pertinently then they that are much his Ancients. Therefore as Niſus ſayth in Virgill, *Neq, hæc noſtris ſpectentur ab annis*, looke not how greene or how gray his head be that ſpeaketh, but let the touch of truth try all, and what by it ſhall appeare to be baſe and counterfait, refuſe and reiect; that which ſhall be found true and ſound, approue and embrace. And that preiudice too ſtrongly poſſeſſe thee not, take my proteſtation, that I neuer haue entertained this opinion raſhly and inconſiderately, but vpon mature aduiſe and deliberation: nor broach it vpon a prepoſterous humour of nouelty or ambition, to build vp mine owne credit & exiſtimation by the ruine and diſparagement of ſo great Diuines (for this were *Subulâ leonem excipere*, to encounter a Lion with a bodkin, as it is in the Prouerbe) but vpon a ſincere affection and deſire, to miniſter ſolid and found conſolation to deſpayring and perplexed minds, which (as after ſhall appeare) vpon this foundation may moſt firmely be raiſed. And now truſting what I ſay ſhall be weighed in the ballance not of preiudice but vpright iudgement, I leaue to preface any farther and come directly to the purpoſe.

Socrat. l. 1. c. 8.

Æneid. l. 9.

Becauſe I purpoſe not to raiſe my building very high I meane not to lay my foundation very deepe: & therefore neither will I play the Phylologer in ſhewing the diuers vſes and acceptations of the word ~~πιστις~~ or *Fides*, *id eſt* Faith, or quote *Ciceros Fiat quod dictum eſt*, or S^t.

Offic. l. 1. *Augustines* [illegible] *at quod dicis*, to doe as a man sayes, for the notation of Faith: neither will I play the Philosopher in discoursing of Physicall or Morall or Ciuill Faith, wherein it were easie to wast much oile and paper: nor lastly will I speake of that Theologicall Faith called Miraculous either in Agent or Patient; which I take to bee none other then a diuine instinct for the working of a Miracle. For albeit they who at the last day shall say Mat. 7. 22. 23. *Lord in thy name haue we not cast out Diuels* may seeme to haue trusted in Miraculous Faith for Iustification, and acknowledgement of Christ: yet notwithstanding neuer any controuersie about it hath exercised the Church of God. To deferre your expectations therefore no farther, three Faiths there seeme to be, which lay claime and title to the priuiledge of *justification*: giue me leaue to distinguish and denominate them according to their Obiects, neither be offended if I handle *noua nomina*, and giue new termes to old matters.

The first is *Fides Historica*, Historicall Faith, which is an Assent of the mind vnto the truth of Gods word, and specially the Gospell. And this Faith whether it be according to the distinction of the Scoolemen, Acquisite, gotten by much hearing and experience without *illumination*, or infused and reuealed by the spirit of *illumination*, it hath no interest in the matter of Iustification. For besides that it is absurd that so generall a Knowledge should iustify, Acquisit Faith the Diuels haue, according to that of S. Iames, *The Diuels beleeue & tremble*. Infused faith the Reprobates may haue, as *Balaam, Iudas, Magus*. Now the Scripture is plaine that iustifying faith is proper and peculiar vnto the Elect, and therefore Historicall faith cannot iustifie.

Acquisite faith. Iam. 2. 19. Infused faith.

The

The second is *Fides Promissionum*, Faith of promises, which is a *Persuasion* or *Assurance* that the promises of God made in Christ, to wit *Iustification*, Remission of sinnes, Adoption, Regeneration, and finally Election it selfe, and eternall Saluation doe particularly pertaine to me, and are mine. Now this although I deny not but in Scripture it is called faith, and that euery Saint of God both may and ought to haue this particular perswasion and Assurance, yet this I confidently deny that this perswasion is that which iustifies a man before God; and my reasons are these. Fourth of promises. * * *

1. If this were *Iustifying* Faith, then whosoeuer liues and dyes without this particular *Assurance*, he cannot be saued, *without faith it is impossible to please God*. But a man may be saued without it; I instance in those our Brethren of *Germanie*, who hold that faith may finally and totally fall away, and consequently that there can be no certainty of Saluation, whom yet the Church of God calleth and counteth brethren, and it were vncharitable to censure of them otherwise. Therefore, or at least-wise probably Faith is not an Assurance. Heb. 11.6.

2. That which is in time after *Iustifying* Faith cannot be that faith. This is vndeniable. But this particular knowledge is in time after faith. This I proue out of 1. Ioh. 5. 13. *These things haue I written vnto you that beleeue in the name of the Sonne of God, that ye may know that ye haue eternall life*. Behold *Beleeuing* goes before, and *Knowledge* comes after: as for that which followeth in the same verse, *and that yee may beleeue*, I interpret it of *Perseuerance* & growth in *Faith*. Howsoeuer, *beleeuing* & *knowing* are di-

ſtinguiſhed, and therefore are not one.

3. That which in nature comes after Iuſtification cannot be Iuſtifying faith. This appeares becauſe Faith is the Efficient inſtrumentall cauſe of Iuſtification, and euery Efficient by the rule of Logick is in nature before the Effect. But this knowledge or Aſſurance is in nature after iuſtificatiō. This I proue thus, the truth of a propoſition is alwayes in nature before the knowledge of the truth: for Propoſitions are not therefore true becauſe knowne ſo, but they are firſt true and then knowne ſo. Therefore this Propoſition, I know I am iuſtified ſpoken by one that is iuſtified, muſt needs preſuppoſe the partie before to be iuſtified. Therefore this knowledge of Iuſtification in nature following Iuſtification it cannot be Iuſtifying faith.

4. In conditionall promiſes there can be no Aſſurance of the thing promiſed before the performance of the condition. V. G. This is a conditionall promiſe in the couenant of workes, doe this and thou ſhalt liue, life is promiſed, but on condition of doing: and therefore vntill we haue performed the condition, we cannot, nor may not looke that God ſhould be reciprocall and giue vs life. So in the couenant of grace, iuſtification is promiſed, but vpon condition of faith: ſo ſayth the Scripture, beleeue, and thy ſinnes ſhall be forgiuen thee. And therefore the condition of beleeuing muſt firſt be performed before we can aſſure our ſelues our ſins are forgiuen. If ſo, then faith going before, and Aſſurance following after, Aſſurance cannot be iuſtifying faith.

5 That

5 That from whence followeth a blasphemous absurdity cannot be a truth: for from truth nought but truth can be concluded. But from this that faith is an Assurance such an absurdity doth follow. What is that? That God commands a man to know an vntruth, & to assure himselfe of that which neuer shall be. For God being truth cannot command falshood to be taken for truth. Nether tell me here, for who art thou that disputest with God? for this is a ruled case in diuinity, God cānot doe things which imply contradiction, and therefore not make vntruth to be truth, or knowledge error. Now that this absurdity follows from hence thus I demonstrate it. God commands the Reprobate to beleeue: For, for vnbeleefe the world shall bee condemned; but no condemnation but for breach of a commandement: for ἁμαρτία ἀνομία Sinne is the transgression of the law, and therefore they are commanded to beleeue. I aske you then what it is to beleeue? you will say, to know, to assure. Therefore God commands the Reprobates to know and bee assured. But this is a blasphemous absurdity: therefore is your opinion absurd which infers it. Ioh. 18. 8. 9. 1 Ioh. 3. 4.

6. That which the wicked may haue cannot be iustifying faith: for it is *Fides Electorum*, the faith of the Elect. But the wicked may haue this perswasion, yea and many haue beene most confidently perswaded that they are in the fauour of God. You will say it is no true perswasion: but I say if forme make truth they are as formally and therefore as truly perswaded of it as the godly. And therefore if the godly are therefore and for this cause iustified because

cause they are strongly perswaded that they are iustified: then why should not the wicked likewise be iustified by his strong perswasion? But in truth these kind of speeches are vnreasonable and senseless, and so the opinion cannot be reasonable.

These sixe reasons shall suffice for the present, although many more might be added: only from hence I gather this Corollary, that if iustifying Faith be not a Knowledge or Assurance, much lesse is it a full knowledge or full Assurance. Nay though we should graunt it to be a knowledge, yet is it against Logick to define it by the perfection of knowledg. For as there is a strong tree so there is a brused reed: as there is a burning lamp, so there is smoking flaxe: as there is ἀνὴρ a Faith come to full age and maturity, so there is νήπιος a Faith, in the nonage and minority. So therefore to define it, were to exclude the weake Faith, and to make the Definition narrower and of lesse latitude then the definite. Besides it is a most discomfortable doctrine vnto a troubled mind, and leads the directest way to desperation: for so the palsie hand of Faith should not receiue Christ. And were not this to quench fire with oile, and to adde Aloes to wormwood? and might not hee that thus comforteth, be counted one of Iobs miserable comforters?

Ob. The godly are said to know and to be perswaded yea the Prophet saith, *By his knowledge shall my righteous seruant iustifie many*, and Faith is ὑπόστασις and ἔλεγχος, *a Subsistence* and *Euidence*.

Io.3.14. Ioh.17.3. Esa.53.11. Heb.11.1.

Ans. First, I graunt the godly may and ought to know: but the question is not of their duty, but what it is which iustifies them.

Secondly,

Secondly, to know, and so likewise the Verbs of Sence in the Hebrew tongue vsually signifieth not onely an act of the Minde or outward Sence, but of the Will and affection also. So in the Psalme יודע יי׳ דרך צדיקים, *The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous*, and in the Gospell *Depart I know you not*, and elsewhere, *I will not heare, see, &c.* that is, God will not so know, heare, see, &c. as in fauour to loue or approue. And so doe I interprete that of the Prophet, Christ being so knowne, as to bee embraced and rested vpon by the Will shall iustify many.

Psal. 1. 6. Mat. 7. 23.

Thirdly, that Definition in the eleuenth to the Hebrewes I deny with *Peter Martyr* and the rest of our Diuines, to bee perfect, but rather by the Effects to describe it. And as for that word ὑπόστασις *Subsistence* whereon you seeme to stand, take this, first that the writers of the new Testament vse words in the same sence that the Seuentie Translators doe. Secondly, that that which in Hebrew is תקוה *Expectation*, that the Septuagint turne ὑπόστασις, as in Ruth ... so that ... in the Hebrewes shall not be Subsistence but expectation or desire of things that are hoped for. But of this *implicandum censeo*, I pronounce nothing; only I conclude this second Faith not to be *iustifying Faith*. And because you shall not count me singular or alone in this point, read *M. Fox* in his booke *de Christo qui est iustificatio nostra*, and you shall find him earnest against this opinion.

Ruth. 1. 12.

The third Faith is *Fides Eorum qui Personalis meriti*, Faith of Popish or of Personall merit, and of this I make

the Obiect to be Christ the Mediator meriting; the Act of it *Fiducia*, a Rest or Dereliction, the Subiect of it the faculty of the Will and not the Vnderstanding, the next End of it Iustification, the remote End, eternall Saluation. And thus I define it, a Rest of the Will vpon Christ and his merits for Iustification and consequently Saluation. In which Definition

That the Obiect of it, is the Person or Personall merit of Christ; the whole tenor of Scripture proues which runs thus, *Ioh.3.16.* *He that beleeueth in mee shall not perish*, and *Ioh.14.1.* *Yee beleeue also in me*, and, *Ioh. 1. 12.* *As many as receiued him, to them hee gaue power to bee the Sonnes of God, that is, to them that beleeued in his Name*, and in six hundred places besides. But if thou wilt be further informed, see *M. Foxe* in the booke before quoted.

That the Act of it is *Fiducia, Affiance*, I report me to all the words vsed in the originall of the old Testament, as not to retire vnto, but to dereliue or Roll vpon, not to trust or put confidence in, and all the rest: and to the forme of words vsed in the new, as *Credere in, Sperare in*, to beleeue and hope in or vpon.

That it is Subiectiuely in the Will, appeares by the Act, for *Fiducia*, Affiance, without controuersie is in the Will: as also by the Obiect Christ, which implies not a Knowledge but *Fiducia* or Rest.

Fiducia, Affiance is *Spei roborata*, a confirmed Hope; therefore if you make Faith to be *Fiducia*, Affiance, you make it likewise to be hope, and vnskilfully confound two distinct vertues. Ergo I deny *Fiducia*, Affiance to bee Hope, although the

the Prince of Schoolmen, *Thomas of Waldering* and his followers haue heeretofore taught it. For,

1 Hope looks to the End which is Saluation; Affiance, to the meanes which is Christs personall merit.

2 The Act of Hope is *expectare*, to looke out for: the Act of Affiance is *innixi*, to leane on, or rest vpon.

3 Hope is of things that are future, but Affiance of that which is present. So yet Faith is *Fiducia*, Affiance: which I further confirme by S. *Augustins* authority, *Credere est amare, & amando in Deum tendere, To beleiue is to loue, and by louing to moue vnto God*, expounding *Amare* by *Confidere*, *Loue* by *Affiance*, according to that Fathers vsuall phrase in his Tractates vpon *Iohn*. In Ioh. 7. tract. 29.

Ob. Faith may be both *Notitia & Fiducia*, Knowledge and Affiance, and so both in the Will and in the Vnderstanding.

Ans. It cannot bee, because it is impossible for one and the same Habit to bee Subiectiuely in two seuerall Facultes of so different natures: Indeed *Bonauenture* saith, Hope is in both, being *certa expectatio*, a certaine expectation. Expectation being in the will, certitude in the Vnderstanding. But I answer, that Certainty is the ground of diuine Hope, but no part of the nature thereof, as knowledge of a thing to be loue-worthy is the ground of loue, for *ignoti nulla cupido*, no desire of that which is vnknowne, but not of the nature of it, and therefore as you cannot place Loue both in the Mind and Will, no more may you *Hope* or *Faith*. In 3. Sent. citante Kemnit. loco de iustif.

Ob. If Faith bee *Fiducia*, Affiance, then the wicked may haue it: for *Balaam* desired the death of the righteous, and some receiue the Word with ioy believing but for a time.

Num. 23.10. Mat. 13.20. 21.

Anſ. There is a double Affiance, the one is sleight and superficiall, and grounded on no other foundation then a generall apprehension that it is good to bee saued by Christ, but leaue not their former course and embrace a new; the other is setled and grounded hauing these precedents;

and a better

1. A particular knowledge of our sinfull estate, examined by the rule of Gods Word.
2. An apprehension of Gods wrath and eternall death deserued by sinne.
3. Vnfained sorrow for sinne with resolution of new life.
4. A knowledge of Christ, and here,
   1. Of his sufficiencie.
   2. His louing inuitation of all to rest on him for Iustification and Saluation.

* * * *

Theſe foure things going before, if by the operation of Gods spirit shall afterward follow a rest vpon Iesus Christ for Iustification & Saluation, I pronounce this Rest to be that Act which doth iustify before God. So that these three Faiths shall bee as the three Propositions of a Categoricke Syllogisme, Faith of Scope being the Maior, Faith of Person or Personall merit being the Assumption, and Faith of Promises being the Conclusion, on this wise.

* * Whosoeuer shall (as formerly is declared) rest vpon the merits of Christ for his Iustification and Saluation

Saluation, he shall be iustified and saued: This the Scripture affirmeth, and to acknowledge the truth thereof is Historicall Faith:

ii. But I doe so rest vpon Christ: This the Conscience priuy to the sincerity of the heart assumeth, which act of Resting I tearme Iustifying Faith:

j. Therefore I am iustified & shall be saued. And this is the Faith of Promise concluded of the former premisses, and is the Assurance before mentioned.

To draw to a Conclusion, concerning these three Faiths I adde farther, that to the Faith of Story many doe not aspire, namely such Paynims and Gentiles to whom God hath not vouchsafed the Ministery of the Word and meanes of knowledge: yet many Reprobates doe, liuing within the compasse and territory of the Church, and remaine for all that vniustified. Vnto the Faith of Person, and that Affiance which I call sleight and superficiall, many likewise of the vessels of wrath doe attaine, but cannot goe one step farther, whereas all and euery of the Elect rest on Christ in the second manner, and vpon the precedents before specified, and are thereby iustified. Vnto the Faith of promise though the children of God may come, and most do come, yet some doubtlesse partly through the strength of flesh, and mixture of infidelity with their Faith, partly through the force and violence of temptation, doe not nor dare not inferre the Conclusion, and yet may be iustified.

Lastly and finally, whereas Faith is distinguished into πληροφορία and ἰσχυρία, full Faith and little Faith, I take it that πληροφορία is not to bee restrained to Faith of Promise onely, but that both are common to all three: so that a weake assent vnto the story is ἰσχυρία, a strong assent

is πληροφορία, a strong Affiance is πληροφορία, a weake Affiance is ὀλιγοπιστία, a bold and confident inference of the Conclusion is πληροφορία, a fearefull and timerous inference is ὀλιγοπιστία. But yet neither of them in the first doth iustifie, although one of them of necessity must goe before Iustification, nor yet in the third, although πληροφορία may and ought to follow: but in the second the least dramme of Affiance though it bee but as a graine of mustard-seed doth iustifie as perfectly as the greatest quantity, because it receiues all Christ, who is not capable of *magis* and *minùs*, more and lesse: as a palsie hand may receiue as much though shakingly, as doth the hand of a strong man stedfastly.

And thus with as much brevity as I could with auoiding of obscurity, I haue deliuered my mind concerning the true nature and definition of iustifying Faith: which whether wee haue or no, how easie it is to finde out, how full of sweet vse and comfort it is in comparison of the common receiued opinion not Eagles onely but Moles may see. If any notwithstanding the euidence of my reasons shall persist in his former iudgement, *suo fruatur per me iudicio, Let him abound in his owne sense*: but for my selfe my word shall alwayes bee τὸ δ' ἐμοὶ μετ' ἐμοῦ, *the right is on my side*. Neuertheless if any by sound and substantiall arguments shall conuince mee, I will not proue refractary or opinionate, but according to S. *Augustins* counsell vnto *Hierome*, and his owne heroicall practice, I will παλινῳδεῖν, and retract all I haue said or written. For I count it a plaine token of a peruerse and illiberall mind, for a man seeing his errour whereby he was misled, rather to bend his wit for to find reason that he was not in error, and so

Ep. 9. ad Hier. In Retract.

to

to bee mad with reaſon; then to frame his wit and will to aſſent and yeeld to truth being demonſtrated vnto him. But vntill that be, giue me leaue to conclude with the Poët:

Hor. l. 1. ep. 6. ad Numic.

——Si quid nouiſti rectius iſtis,
Candidus imperti; ſi non, his vtere mecum.

If ought you know righter then here you ſee,
Impart it friendly, els this vſe with me.

I. D.

A DE-

A DEFENCE OF THE FORMER TREATISE OF IVSTIFYING FAITH,

Against the answer of N. B.

N. B.

IT had been good, M. Downe, *you had been aduised and warned by* Diphilus *in* Athenæus *who said,* ἔλαθες λύχνον λαβὼν πρὸ τῆς λυχνίας, accepta candela candelabrum quærebamus, we tooke the candle before wee had the candlesticke; *meaning that it sauoureth not of prouidence to light the one before wee bee sure of the other. Without doubt you would not then haue builded your doctrine here in this Cittie, till you had layd a good foundation for the same, euen Iesus Christ, who standeth in the midst of the seuen golden Candlesticks,*

Lib. 15. in fabula cui titulus ἀγύρτης.

1 Cor. 3. 11. Apoc. 1.

dlesticks, and is the sole foundation of the eternall verity.
Mat. 18. *But such was the iudgement of God cast vpon vs for our sinnes, that refusing the wholesome doctrine of his Word, and following (instead and steed of our owne inuentions, we should now giue heed to lying spirits, and be led away with the spirit of error. But we bete them by whom offences come, you cannot escape the hand of God except you speedily repent, and make satisfaction to this offended flock.*

I. D.

Indeed, *M. Baxter*, if I haue presumed to determine a question meerly Theologicall by such principles as are heterogeneall, and improper vnto the science of Diuinity: I must needs confesse I haue foully faulted, and iustly deserued the blame of Improuidence you lay vpon me. For it is impossible to demonstrate, saith the Phi-
Poster. l. 1. c. 7. §. 1. & 4. losopher, passing from one kind to another: as for Arithmetike to demonstrate a probleme or conclusion in Ge-
Eccles. 2, 14. ometrie. But had your eyes been where *Solomon* sayth a wise mans eyes should be when you read my writing, you could not but perceiue that I had builded my doctrine vpon that very same good foundation you speake of, euen Iesus Christ and his blessed word. For whatsoeuer I haue affirmed throughout that whole discourse I haue sufficiently warranted either by expresse testimony of Scripture, or (which is equiualent) by necessary collection from it. Vnto your aduice therfore out of *Dyphilus* in *Athenæus* I answer with the like but more sanctified words of *Athanasius*, *Loe we speake boldly out of the sacred Scriptures of holy and religious Faith, and*
Orat. contra Arrian. *setting*

setting the candle as it were vpon the candlestick doe wee thus pronounce of the nature and definition of Iustifying Faith.

But put case *M. Baxter* I had been mistaken either in the truth of the conclusion, or in the proofes thereof, yet considering at least wise the probability of the one and the comfortablenes of the other, Charity I am sure would haue iudged the publishing thereof to haue proceeded (to vse the words of *Augustin*) rather from the errour of loue, then the loue of error. The more vncharitable are you that being not able to conuince mee of the least vntruth, ranke me notwithstanding in the number of lying spirits, and so peremptorily denounce wo and iudgement against me. Wherein as you bewray how little you sauour of his mild spirit who chose rather to come in a still and soft voice, then in a tempest and whirlewind: so greatly are you deceiued if you thinke such causes and idle meanes either affright or affect me. No no I am not so simple to beleiue that the earthquakes when moles beginne to heaue, or that thunderbolts presently flie abroad the world when euery hot braine threatens fire from heauen. For *as the bird by wandring and the swallow by flying escapeth, so the vndeserued curse shall not come*, saith *Solomon*. And therefore vnlesse you can proue mee in deliuering this doctrine to haue beene an vnadoised *Barnabas*, I haue no cause to feare when you proue your selfe but a rash and hasty *Bonnerges*.

1 King. 19. 12.

Prou. 26. 2.

Act. 4. 36.

Mar. 3. 17.

N. B.

Your Sermon made here in Bristol Nouemb. 5. 1601.

ſtuffed with quirks, full of elenchs, and ſubtle diſtinctions, wholly bent it ſelfe againſt the truth of God, and hath ſhaken the well affected minds of many, who by your Sophiſmes ſeduced ſtarve know by what meanes they ſhall bee ſaued. You gaue vs Mandragoras to drinke, and vnder a ſugred potion of your owne ſole contriuing caſt vpon vs the ſpirit of ſlumber. Was it not a bold part thus in peace to play the Lion, and rent in ſunder (vnder pretence of truth) the bleſſed vnion of holy piety? to deliuer ſuch new coined, ſtrange, vncouth, and ſingular definitions, diuiſions or diſtinctions of Iuſtifying Faith (being indeed Callida mendacia *craftie vntruths) as* Apollo *himſelfe could by no meanes vnderſtand (to vſe the phraſe of* Antiphanes) *and then to boaſt that ſcarce* Archimedes *could better and more liuely haue depainted his Theoremes then you iuſtifying Faith: then you forſooth had then againſt all writers old and new in one ſole and ſillie Sermon walking without fire in the darke deliueated, yea demonſtrated as you ſay true Iuſtifying Faith the comfort of a Chriſtian man.*

Demoſth. in Philip.

Ariſtoph. in Pluto.

Plaut. Moſtel. Athen. Dipnos. li. 3. Cic. pro Cluent.

Theocrit. hodæp.

T. D.

Three heinous faults you charge my Sermon withall, Vntruth in the Matter, Sophiſtrie in the Manner, and Breach of peace in the iſſue and euent: all which, if one dead flie bee ſufficient to corrupt a whole Alabaſter of ſweet ointmẽt, as the wiſeman ſaith, muſt needs be more then enough to diſcredit one poore and ſimple Sermon.

Eccleſ. 10. 1.

As touching the Matter, you know that ſo much thereof as concernes the point in queſtion is euery way parallell and agreeing vnto the writing I ſent you: and there-

therfore if as you say *it haue bent it selfe against the truth of God*, loe here is Rhodes, according to the Prouerbe, Æsop. vlet vs see your leap, shew it in this and it shall be granted you in that also. Otherwise being so foullie ouerseene in charging a written tract whereof you haue taken so long aduisement and deliberation, you will hardly bee beleeued in accusing a transient speech which might happily bee past your eares before your vnderstanding had leasure to apprehend it.

As for the Manner, it cannot lightly be more absurd then is your manner of quarrelling at it. For if it be *so stuft with quirks, elenchs, sophismes, and subtleties*, how is it that by & by you call it in contempt *a sillie Sermon?* And if it containe such *new coined, strange, vncouth, and singular definitions, diuisions, or distinctions as Apollo himselfe could by no meanes vnderstand*, how come you to know that they are *Callida mendacia, craftie vntruths*, vnderstanding so readily what *Apollo himselfe by no means could?* Surely *M. Baxter* it was somewhat vnseasonable while you were chalenging me for I know not what Sophismes and Subtleties, thus to entangle your selfe in these labyrinths and mazes of contradiction. But in truth you play right *Senecas Harpaste* with mee, and as she being blind herselfe, euer complained of the darke- Sen. ep. 50. nesse of the house: so you wanting either wit or will to vnderstand tell me that *I walke without fire in the darke*, and impute *Obscurity* vnto my preaching. A vice from which I haue euer beene abhorring as they know well who are mine ordinary Auditors, or haue had experience of my courses. For as in iudgement I haue alwayes esteemed Perspicuity a principall vertue in Oratory, vt-

cerly disliking the vanity and affectation of those men who with *Antony* desire rather to bee admired then vnderstood: so haue I continually endeuoured to frame my practice vnto this iudgement, thinking that then I haue vsed best eloquence whē I haue spoken with the greatest euidence. If therefore, as *Austin* saith, *I point you out with my finger the old or new moone, or some starre not so cleare which you would gladly see, and your sight be so weake that it cannot reach so far as my finger, you haue no reason to be offended with me.* You should rather pray God to vouchsafe vnto you the eyesalue of his spirit that you may see: I can but lend you my finger, sight I cannot giue you.

Sueton. Aug. c. 86.

De doct. Christ. Prolog.

Reu. 3. 18.

Now for the issue and euent, you say that like *a potion of Mandrake it hath cast vpon you the spirit of slumber, and like a Lion hath rent in sunder the blessed vnion of holy Piety*, that is in other termes hath bred in you at once both a Lethargie and frenzie, which is very neere a-kin vnto that wittie speech of the Apothecaries wife, that *Pepper is hot in working and cold in operation*. But tell me *M. Baxter* in plaine sadnesse, hath that Sermon indeed *so shaken the well affected minds of many that now they scarce know by what meanes they shall be saued?* For it seemeth strange to me that one sole and fillie Sermon should shake the minds of so many, and those so well affected too, and that in so important a case as the meanes of saluation: If your meaning be, as I guesse it is, that opposing the vulgar definition of Faith, and defining otherwise then formerly they conceiued of it, doubts and disputes haue growne thereupon, and consequently the interruption of your peace, and the vnion of Piety: I answer, first, that necessary doctrines must not bee suppressed, nor studi-

ous

ous minds depriued of wholesome instructions because of some inconueniences which may happen to follow. For as *Augustin* saith, *if vpon the publishing of truth offence be taken, it is better to giue way to such offence then that truth be abandoned.* Secondly, all the doubt and dispute that can grow vpon that Sermon is no other then this, of two definitions whether is the better, which I suppose is not to call in question the meanes of saluation. And surely if euery difference in the Logicall handling of a point in Diuinity were *the renting in sunder of the vnion of piety*, there is no Diuine but playes the Lion, and deserues the same aspersion you cast vpon mee. Lastly, better is doubting of truth, then resolution in error: for doubting stirs vp seeking, and seeking hath the promise of finding, and diuers I know vnto whom this promise euen in this particular hath graciously beene performed to the full satisfaction of their minds, and the vnspeakable comfort of their conscience, which comfort of conscience if you vnderstand *by the spirit of slumber* you doe no lesse then blaspheme: vnlesse you can shew that it is grounded vpon error which I know you can neuer doe.

De lib. arb.

Mat. 7. 7.

N. B.

Well sith so it pleased you to trie your wit and follow your will that vpon a sole confident opinion of your sound arguments, you haue bidden battell to all the learned men of Christendome, bitten famous Melanchton, *honorable* P. Martyr, *blessed* Caluin, *renowned* Beza, *thrice honorable* Grynæus *and* Polanus, *snapt & snarled at glorious* Whitaker, *and excellent* Perkins (*whom as you say you droue so hard*

hard to the wall with your ſudden arguments that hee knew not what to anſwer) yea all Fathers and writers both old and new for theſe 1600. yeeres. Sith I ſay you would needs come barefoot to theſe mountaines, giue leaue I pray you to mee one of the leaſt but the moſt offended in the abſence of the reſt, for the glory of God and the ſatisfying of our people, to ſift your arguments as you haue leyd them downe in writing, and ſhape you an anſwer for the defence of Iuſtifying Faith, till you graſple with other moſt learned mens writings which ſhortly you ſhall receiue. Wherein if your errors be eſpied, it was your fault ſo confidently to deliuer in writing vnder your hand ſuch abſurdities: praying you to remember Διόνυσε ἐν μυρμηκιᾷ ἐδὲ τὸ χεῖλος, *who ſpits in an Ants neſt ſhall haue ſore lips.*

Theocr. in Epitaph.

Dinoloch. apud Heſych.

I. D.

It is not in our power, ſaith the Philoſopher, to entertaine what opinion we pleaſe, neither doth the mind chuſe whether it will aſſent vnto the truth of a concluſion yea or no: but ſimply and of the neceſſity of its nature yeelds to that part of the contradiction whereunto by force of ſyllogiſme it is determined. If therefore the arguments which I haue vſed in this queſtion bee indeed as they ſeeme vnto me ſound and neceſſary: you may as well chide the Sun for mouing towards the weſt, or the earth for reſting ſtedfaſtly on her center, as me for being ſwayed and perſwaded by them. And yet by your leaue I was not ſo tranſported with Confidence, but that I ſtill kept my ſelfe within the bounds of Modeſty. For although it pelaſe you in the former ſection to charge me with

De Anim. l. 3. cap. 3.

with *boasting that scarce Archimedes could better and more liuely haue painted his Theoremes then I iustifying Faith*: yet was I in truth as farre from it, as you are from truth in affirming of it; submitting my selfe in all humility vnto the censure of Gods Church, and promising vpon conuiction of my error to reuerse what euer I had said.

Yea but very insolently *I haue bidden battell to all the learned men of Christendome, bitten, snapt, and snarled at Melanchthon, Martyr &c. yea all Fathers and Writers both old and new for those 1600. yeares.* Intolerable arrogance I confesse if your accusation be iust: for who but a presumptuous and proud *Goliah* would in such opprobrious manner defie and reuile the host of the liuing God? But tell me I beseech you what are those despitefull and contumelious tearmes wherewith I haue so reproched those famous and excellent men? Nay did I in my Sermon so much as name either *Melanchthon*, or *Martyr*, or *Caluin*, or *Beza*, or *Grynæus*, or *Polanus*, or *Whitaker*, or *Perkins*, whom yet you say I snapt and snarled at? For that you adde particularly of *M. Perkins*, as if I had boasted *by my sudden arguments to haue driuen him so hard to the wall as he knew not what to answer*, is but a blacke drop of your slanderous pen. The truth is this, that in a priuate conference I told you, that he being demãded, if *Faith be an assurance of our present state in grace and future saluation*, what comfort remained for him who not feeling this assurance thinks himselfe to bee without Faith and consequently in the state of damnation: his answer was (which also in his books he hath published) that desire of assurance is in the acceptation of God as assurance indeed: to the which I sayd

1 Sam. 17. 26.

I could no way yeeld, seeing by the couenant of Grace, actuall Faith it selfe is absolutely required vnto Iustification, and therefore actuall assurance, if Faith bee assurance. Besides this priuate speech all I haue publikely said or written, is no more but this in generall, that though my opinion differ from the writings and doctrine of most learned and worthy Diuines, to whom as farre inferiour I owe all respect and reuerence; yet being Gods freeman I cannot endure to bee mans Bondman and sweare to all they say. And is not this the same in effect which all our Diuines answer when they are charged by the aduersary to dissent from the Fathers? Let one *Whitaker* speake for them all; *We are*, saith he, *not the seruants but the Sons of the Fathers: if out of the law and from diuine authority they prescribe any thing vnto vs we obey them as* Parents: *if they command ought against the voice of the heauenly doctrine, wee say wee must harken not vnto them but God. You Iesuits like bondmen and base slaues admit without iudgement and reason all the sayings of the Fathers, fearing I thinke the gibbet or whip if yee refuse any.* Now *M. Baxter*, say if you dare, that glorious *Whitaker* with the rest of our Diuines bite, and snap, and snarle at the Fathers as well as I: if you dare not, and yet I vse no other language then they doe, then are biting, and snapping, and snarling, but your owne doggish teeth, arguing rather notorious *Sycophancie* in you then such barbarous incivility in me.

Contrà Durzum.

Well yet *sith you will needs*, say you, *come barefoot to these mountaines, giue me leaue to sift your arguments and to shape you an answer for the defence of Iustifying Faith.* Sir it was reason I should pull off my shooes and come barefoot to these mountaines, because the ground on

Exod. 3. 5.

which

which I was an hand is holy. Neuertheleſſe in this encounter with you I truſt you ſhall find *my feet ſo well ſhod with the preparation of the Goſpell of peace*, that I need not care what briers or thornes ſoeuer you plant in my way. And therefore good leaue haue you, fit my arguments in Gods name as you pleaſure, for to that very end ſent I them you in writing. But I am afraid leaſt inſteed of ſifting, I find from you nothing elſe but meere ſhifting, as indeed I doe not. For to ſome of my arguments you ſhape no anſwer at all; ſome you miſshape and turne cleane out of the forme I ſet vpon them, to not one of them doe you ſhape ſo much as probable or tolerable anſwer. So that although you ſeeme very ambitious and greedie of the title, yet if you haue no better ſkill in ſifting arguments, and ſhaping anſwers, you will hardly obtaine ſo high an honor as to bee ſtiled *Defender of the Faith*. Ephes. 6. 15.

Further you tell me that *ſhortly I ſhall receiue the writings of other moſt learned men, and graſple with them*. They ſhall bee welcome *M. Baxter* whenſoeuer they come: for the more you are that impugne the truth, the more honorable will the victory be. But I beſeech you, Sir, when will that ſhortly you ſpeake of be expired? for it is now more then two yeeres ſince you firſt threatned me with them, as by the date of your writing appeareth: and yet hitherto could I neuer heare either from them or of them whether they be white or blacke. Only it ſeemes they are very angrie Piſmires, that a man cannot ſpit among them without ſore lips. But when I ſhall ſpeake with theſe enemies in the gate, as the Pſalmiſt ſaith, I hope they ſhall finde my lips ſo ſeaſoned with the ſalt of grace, and ſo well prouided of an anſwer, that I need not Pſal. 127. 5. Col. 4. 6.

feare if they proue a nest, I say not of Ants onely, but euen of Waspes and Hornets also. In the meane season if they bee so deeply learned as you pretend, how is it that you so hastily preuent them, and haue not the manners to stay till your betters haue spoken? It is not, you say, vpon presumption of your greater learning, being one of the least but out of a greater measure of zeale, as being the most offended. But, *M. Baxter*, they that doe the works of *Zimri*, haue not lightly in them the affection of *Phinees*. And seeing you will needs bee the most offended, shall I say being the most offending? Certainly hauing no iust cause of offence giuen you, it is not so much either the glory of God, or the satisfaction of your people, as your own factiousnesse and vaineglory that sets you so forward in this businesse, and makes you so impatient to thinke of the second place. Of a colder temper it seemes are those learned *Rabbies* you scarre me withall, who while you hazard your selfe in the forlorne hope, wisely prouide for their owne security in the reerward. And as the *Turke* vses to marshall the baasest of his nations in the front of the battell, that the enemies armes being wearied, & swords blunted vpon them, his *Ianizars* may find the lesse danger and resistance, so these I thinke are not vnwilling that you with your wrangling a while comber and annoy men, that hauing spent my strength vpon you, I should not be able to endure the force of their second charge. But vnto this [illegible]ish policy I oppose the old *Roman* wisdom; Veget. l. 1. c. 11. and as they exercising their young souldiers to skirmish and [illegible] Martiall actiuities against a post prepared [illegible]erby with more readines and skill to encounter a true enemie: so will I by trying and experiencing

cocing my ſelfe vpon you) fit and prouide my ſelfe to
that better entertainment vnto thoſe learned aduerſaries,
whenſoeuer they ſhall pleaſe to aſſaile me.

N. B.

Your writings are well poliſhed, and ſhew whence you
came, and where you were bred: but as ſmooth as they bee,
they cannot helpe you nor ſaue you from blemiſh, except you
ſpeedily (which I wiſh) ſnatch the new hatched Maiſters.
For the faire ſhooe helpeth no man of the Gowt.

Plutarch. περὶ εὐθυμίας.

I. D.

Here, *M. Bunny*, you beſtow vpon me once for all
a few drops of your holy water ſprinkle, telling me that
my writings are ſmooth and well poliſhed, ſauouring
ſomething of the place *whence I came and where I was*
bred: but withall remembring me (I thinke leſt I ſhould
grow too proud of your praiſes) that though the ſhooe
be faire, the foot is gowtie, that is, though the ſtile and
manner of handling be Schollerly, yet the argument and
matter is erronious if not hereticall. And ſo, as *Hierome*
ſpeaketh, *you caſt vpon me an honorable kind of contumely,*
commending me a little for ſome good parts, but vtterly
bereauing me of the truth of Faith. Which commenda-
on alſo here vouſafed mee in groſſe, anon you rob mee
of againe by retaile, allowing mee nothing but ridicu-
lous, vnlearned, and inkehorne ſpeeches, and ſcarce af-
fording me skill enough to compoſe a Syllogiſme. But
the beſt is, your iudgement is not the trueſt touch to trie
deſert by: and therfore whether you praiſe or diſpraiſe

Ep. 6 ad Pam. & Ocean.

it no way moues me, the one cannot better me, the other cannot disparage mee. Neuertheleſſe if you can plainly and directly ſhew that like another Ixion embracing a cloud inſteed of *Iuno*, I meane my owne fancie inſteed of Gods truth, I haue begotten thereupon theſe monſters (as you tearme them) of opinions: I will as you wiſh mee ſpeedily ſnetch them, and daſh their heads againſt the ſtones that they grow not vp to the ſtrength and ſtature of Giants, to the further danger and diſturbance of the Church. But till then pardon mee, if I neither ſnetch them, nor feare blemiſh by them: nay if as the bleſſed of-ſpring of celeſtiall verity I ſtill feed and cheriſh them with the ſincere milke of the word that they may grow thereby to the further comforting of diſtreſſed ſoules, and building vp of the Saints in their moſt holy Faith.

Pſal. 137. 9.

1 Pet. 2. 2.

Iude 20.

And thus much in briefe for anſwer to your Prologue: now take wee a view alſo of the Diſputation it ſelfe. Wherein if you obſerue due proportion and *Decorum*, as that is no other then a head without wit or braine, ſo this can bee no better then a body without heart and ſpirit.

N. B.

But that I may orderly proceed, I will briefely [illegible] *the ſtate of the Queſtion betwixt vs, and next ſhewing how it is holden by you and denyed by mee. The Queſtion is whether iuſtifying Faith by the Church for 1600. yeeres bee rightly defined: you deny it, I affirme it.*

The Queſt.

L. D.

In word you promiſe orderly proceeding, but indeed you

you lay the foundation of Babel, and by peruerting the ſtate of the Queſtion diſorder and confound the whole Diſputation. For whereas I inquire *What is the true Nature and definition of iuſtifying Faith*, and determine that that act whereby a man ſtands iuſtified before God, is not Aſſurance in the Mind but Affiance in the Will: you to foreſtall the reader on your ſide, and to worke all the preiudice you can againſt mee, ſubſtitute inſteed thereof this enuious demaund, *Whether iuſtifying Faith by the Church for 1600. yeeres bee rightly defined*, and boldly auerre that I maintaine it negatiuely & you affirmatiuely. How you can quit your ſelfe of manifeſt preuarication herein I ſee not, vnleſs perhaps you ſay that albeit directly & in preciſe tearmes I affirme not ſo much; yet defining otherwiſe then the Church hitherto hath done, indirectly and by conſequence I auouch no leſſe; But this figleafe is not broad enough to couer your nakednesſe. For ſuppoſe it were ſo, yet was it your dutie to haue retained the Queſtion in that very forme of words I propounded it vnto you, and not in lieu of my Concluſion to place a Conſectary of your owne collection. If whereas you hold that Faith is Aſſurance, I ſhould ſtate the Queſtion thus, *Whether God commaund a lie to bee beleeued as true*, and then peremptorily pronounce that you affirme it and I deny it, would you not think your ſelfe much wronged and abuſed? And yet this abſurditie neceſſarily following vpon that opinion, as in my fift Argument is firmely proued: I ſhould ſo doing but ſerue you with your owne ſauce and repay you in your owne coine. How forcible therefore ſoeuer your Conſequence may be, in this place it is very vnſeaſonable, and with more credit ſhould you haue perfor-

med

med your promise of orderly proceeding, if you had reserued it thither where you meane to argue against mee. But *Camels*, saith *Pliny*, loue not to drinke till they haue troubled the water, nor Sophisters to dispute till they haue clouded the Question.

Hist. Nat. l. 8. ca. 18.

Neuertheless because you vaunt so much and so often of all the learned men of Christendome, all the Church, all the world, all Fathers, all Writers, old and new, Greeke and Latin for these 1600. yeeres: giue mee leaue in this place once for all to apply mine answer thereunto. I say therefore that it is but a vaine and idle brag full of Arrogance, Temerity, and Vntruth; Arrogance in that you would seeme to haue read all Authors that haue written these 1600. yeeres: which if you were such a glutton of bookes, and withall had the strength of an oke and the time of *Mathusalah*; yet could you not by any meanes performe: Temerity in that you thinke with the countenance of one inartificiall argument, to outbraue so many sound Demonstrations grounded on Gods Word and according with right reason: Vntruth, in that you beare the world in hand as if all Writers both old and new were cleerely against me, not so much as one giuing his suffrage and voice with mee, whereas in my Treatise I haue expresly shewed the contrary.

For first touching the Negatiue, that Faith is not Assurance, I vouched therein the authority of that reuerend and worthy man of God *M. Foxe*, whose words anon you shall heare at large: In the meane season it behoueth you, if you will bee beleeued in this point, to produce the cloud of witnesses you so much boast of, that wee may heare whether they will depose the contradictory hereunto, namely that Faith is Assurance.

For

For howſoeuer you ſay you haue no fewer then All, yet it may bee when all comes to all you will proue as ill ſtored of teſtimonies as the wiſe man of *Athens* was of ſhipping, who being not worth the pooreſt ſhallop in the harbor, bare himſelfe notwithſtanding for owner of all the gallies that arriued therein. And ſurely hauing throughly ſearched your Anſwer to this purpoſe, I find the nũber (by you cited) ſo ſmall, that I need not much skill in Arithmetike to ſumme them vp: for, the totall amounts to no more then an Vnity, and all your Authors are but one *Caluin*, once alledged in the front thereof. Vnto whom I denie not but you might haue ioyned ſome other of the later Writers: but what are they to all both old and new for 1600. yeeres? For as for the ancient Fathers, not one of them (ſo farre as I can learne) affirmeth the iuſtifying act of Faith to be Aſſurance: and among the Moderne it is more then manifeſt that a good part of them flatly denyeth it. So that being backed of ſo few, and yet craking ſo loudly of All, you play right the glorious Souldier in the Comedie, who hauing but foure men in all the world, beſtirred himſelfe ſo buſily with three of them as if hee had been muſtering a whole Legion, and at length miſſing the fourth, gallantly demaunded where all the reſt were. Ter. Eunuch. act. 4. Scen. 7.

Againe touching the Affirmatiue, that Faith is Affiance, I quoted that paſſage of S. *Auguſtin*, *To beleeue is to loue, and by louing to moue vnto God*. Now Loue (by which that Father vſually defineth Vertue) properly is not an act of Faith, becauſe of Charity; Charity & Faith being two different and diſtinct Habits. And therefore by Loue you are to vnderſtand generally an act of the will, it being an affection of that Facultie: as if in plainer In my Treatiſe De morib. Eccl. ca. 15. 1 Cor. 13. 13.

tearmes he ſhould haue ſaid, To beleiue is that act of the Will whereby we moue vnto God: Which elſewhere he expreſſeth more clearly, ſaying, *He that commeth vnwillingly beleeueth not, and he that beleeueth not commeth not: for we run not vnto Chriſt by walking but beleeuing; neither come we by the motion of the body, but by the will of the heart.* So that Faith being in *S. Auguſtins* iudgement an act or motion of the Will, what other can it bee then Affiance? For, as *Thomas* ſayth, that motion in the appetite which immediately followeth Deſire to obtaine that good which wee eſteeme poſſible to be obtained, is Affiance: Adde vnto him Theophylact; *Hee that with great affection beleeueth, ſtretcheth out his heart towards God.* And *what doth it? It is united vnto him; and the heart enflamed gathereth great certainty that it ſhall obtaine his deſires.* Where by the way obſerue that certainty is concluded out of Faith, and therefore can no more bee Faith then the Concluſion can bee one of the Premiſes. So Barnard, *To beleeue in God is to ſet all our hope in him.* And our Diuines in the Conference of *Altemburg* define it by Affiance in the Heart and Will. In a word all thoſe who ſeat it only or principally in the will, accord with mee. For although defining it popularly they put vſually into their Deſcriptions, *Aſſent vnto ſupernaturall veraities* which is an act of the mind; yet making not that, but Affiance only the proper act that iuſtifies, they doe in effect fully accord and agree with me. So that you ſee I am not driuen to ſo neere an exigent, but vnto your one I can oppoſe more then you are aware of. And yet had I farre more, I would not vpon preſumption, either of their number or authority, ſay vnto you, as *Hierome* ſometime wrote vnto Auguſtin, *Suffer*

In Ioh. 6. tract. 26.

12. q. 40. a. 2. ad 2.

In Marc. 11.

Serm. de Sanct. to Andr.

Colloq. Altemb.

Ep. 11. inter. ep. Aug.

mee

me I pray thee to erre with ſuch men: and ſith you ſee I haue ſo many companions in error with mee, you ought to bring forth one at leaſt that ioynes with you. For who is he that would willingly erre with whomſoeuer or how many ſoeuer? But hauing as S. *Peter* ſpeaketh a more ſure word of the Prophets for my warrant, I rather conclude with that free and ingenuous anſwer of Auguſtin to Hierom, *More teſtimonies I thinke might I eaſily haue found if I had read much: but the Apoſtle* Paul *ſhall bee vnto mee inſteed of them all, yea, aboue them all.* 2 Pet. 1, 19. Epiſt. 19.

N. B.

Let vs therefore ſee what you affirme and wee agree to be our iuſtifying Faith, and how you impugne it. We agree both in this that iuſtifying Faith (as we hold it and you deny it) is A certaine knowledge infuſed into the hearts of the elect by the Holy Ghoſt by which they conſtantly agree to all things reuealed in the Word of God, and alſo a firme Aſſurance whereby euery one of the Elect relieth vpon the Promiſes of Chriſt, fully reſoluing that Chriſt with all his merits are giuen to him for iuſtification and eternall life. Now as you deny this to bee iuſtifying Faith, ſo againe let vs ſee what you count iuſtifying Faith to bee. Iuſtifying Faith is a reſt of mans will vpon Chriſt and his merits of Iuſtification and Saluation. The validity of your definition wee will view anon by Gods help: in the meane ſeaſon let vs ſee with what engins of rare wit and ſolid Syllogiſmes you endeuour to ouerthrow the former definition of ours, conſiſting vpon the generall Word, the cauſes, the effects, the proper Subiect and Adiuncts or eſſentiall Properties.

Fides iuſtificans in adultis quæ ſit.

Iuſtifying Faith agreed vpon vs both as holden by the Church.

M. Downes iuſtifying Faith.

I. D.

Your ſecond cogitations I ſee are wiſer then the firſt, and now you ſhoot with far better aime then erewhile, miſſing not much of the right ſtate of the Queſtion. For the Definition here attributed vnto me is I confeſſe that which I defend, and the other aſſumed vnto your ſelfe is that alſo which I impugne: I meane ſo farre forth as it makes Knowledge the Generall Word, and Particular Aſſurance the Act, or as you tearme it the adiunct or eſſentiall Propertie. For otherwiſe that cauſally it is from the Holy Ghoſt, ſubiectiuely in the elect, and effectuall vnto Iuſtification is not queſtioned by mee, but equally acknowledged of vs both.

Now the validity of my definition you ſay you will view anon, and anon by Gods help will I farther maintaine it againſt you. In the meane ſeaſon let vs ſee how skilfully you can vſe your buckler hand, and ward of thoſe arguments I obiect againſt you. And that the reader may more eaſily conceiue the courſe of our diſputation, and how pertinently things are applyed: as hitherto before my Reply I haue ſet downe the words of your Anſwer, ſo henceforward before your Anſwer will I ſet downe the words alſo of the Treatiſe I ſent you:

Treatiſe.

I will not play the Philologer in ſhewing the diuerſe vſe and acceptation of the word *πίστις* or *Fides*, or quote Ciceros *Fiat quod dictum eſt*, or Auguſtins *Fac quod dicis* for the Notation of it: nor play the Philoſopher in diſcour-

discoursing of Physicall or Morall or Ciuill Faith, not lastly will I speake of Theologicall Miraculous Faith.

N. B.

No doubt but then we are like to heare good stuffe seeing at the first entrance into the lists you refuse to bee tried by those that best knew the meaning of the things which they would expresse, and therefore found out names fit to note their natures. But Tertullian *could have told you (whose words you cite in your preface though falsly)* Si nominis, *inquit*, odium est, quis nominum reatus, quæ nominum accusatio? Nisi si aut barbarum sonat vox aliqua nominis, aut infaustum, aut maledicum, aut impudicum. If you find fault with the Word wherein doth the Word offend, what can you say against it? except the Word bee barbarous, or ominous, or slanderous, or vnchast.

Nomen quod rem notat quasi notamẽ nec aliter enunciari res possit nisi aliquo nomine. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. c. 7. lib. imperfecto. Apoc. adu. Gent. c. 46. Ib. ca. 3.

I. D.

Stumbling at the threshold they say bodes no good, and little hope doe you giue of honest and plaine dealing in the sequele, that make your beginning with so fond and shamelesse a cauill. For neither doe I refuse *to be tried by those who found out the names of things*, neither doe my words import any disliking of the word *Fides*: only I omit to discourse of such things as are vulgarly knowne and not greatly materiall to my purpose. *Tertullian* indeed tels mee that the Gentiles sometimes hated the very name of Christian, persecuting it with as much rigour in them that bare it as they did notorious wickednesse in others, albeit the Name neither were

Apolog. c. 2. & 3.

barbarous, nor ominous, nor ſlanderous, nor vnchaſt. But what is this to the purpoſe? vnleſſe you ſay I am growne into as deep a deteſtation of the word *Faith*, as Pagans were of the name of Chriſtiã, which none but an infidell can doe, and no other then a Satanicall and diuelliſh ſpirit would obiect vnto mee. For as the thing ſignified by the Word is that moſt noble grace of the Spirit of God which giueth the forme and being to a Chriſtian man: ſo the Word alſo I confeſſe hath from the beginning both beene ſanctified by the Holy Ghoſt, and religiouſly retained in the Church to ſignifie the ſame; neither can it now without ſacrilege and impiety either bee violated or diſuſed. It is not I therefore that finde fault or am offended with the Word: it is you rather that offer open violence vnto the plaineſt ſentence, giuing withall ſtrong ſuſpicion, that hauing once paſſed the bounds of modeſtie, wilfully peruerting the ſtate of the queſtion, you will hereafter ſteele your forehead and waxe recheleſſe of ſaying any thing.

But I haue cited, you ſay, the words of *Tertullian* falſly. Not ſo falſly as you haue cited him idly. For whereas that Father ſaith, *Philoſophers player-like affect truth, and affecting corrupt it as being ambitious of glory: but Chriſtians neceſſarily deſire it, and intirely practice it as being carefull of their ſaluation:* I report it ſomewhat more breefly thus, Although Philoſophers player-like affect the truth as being ambitious of glory: yet Chriſtians ſtudiouſly follow it as being carefull of their Saluation. So that omiſſion of a word or twaine without any alteration of the ſence, in a matter neither hindering nor furthering the cauſe in hand, or ſome ſuch toy, as *Hierome* ſpeaketh, is the crime you charge mee withall.

Apol. c. 46.

Epiſt. 101. ad Pammach.

For

For the true meaning of the sentence I am sure I haue kept: as for the words, because I endited out of my memory being then in *Bristol*, and vse not to cary my Library about with mee when I trauell abroad, it was easie to mistake or forget some part of them.

N. B.

But you knowing the very meaning of the Greeke word πειθω *comming of* πεποιθα *persuasus sum vel fui, whereof commeth also* persuadere, *to perswade, would haue stayed you from condemning vs that say Faith is a full perswasion: Besides the Hebrew word* אמן *comming of that which a man simply is perswaded of, and the Greeke comming of the Passiue* πεισθηναι *to bee perswaded, if you would might haue stayed you from incurring this infamy, and me from this labour. It had therefore as I thinke beene much better for you to haue been Philologos then Antipistos. But let vs see how you proceed.*

I haue beene or am perswaded.

Truth.

I. D.

Kemnitius a graue and learned Diuine saith that so great a matter as is the Definition of iustifying Faith is not to bee committed only vnto Grammaticall disputations: and yet so great store doe you make of one poore and naked Etymologie, as if there need no more but the knowledge thereof to decide the controuersie. For this, you say, if *I would might haue stayed mee from condemning you, and eased you from this labour*. Let vs therefore (seeing you are so confident vpon it) trie the strength of this *Athilles*.

Loco de Iustif.

Faith

Faith, you ſay, *in the Greeke and Hebrew comes from a word ſignifying to bee perſwaded*, Ergo *Faith is a Perſwaſion*. Sir I deny your Conſequence. For firſt, euery word beares not alwayes the ſignification of the primitiue from which it is deriued, partly becauſe the number of words being certaine and definite, but infinite of things, one word of neceſſity muſt haue more then one meaning: partly by vſe (which is the rule and warrant of ſpeech) they oftentimes degenerate from their natiue and firſt ſignification into a ſtrange and farre different meaning. So that if your kind of reaſoning may paſſe for currant, great danger and error muſt needs enſue vpon it. For example. Hypoſtaſis if wee regard the firſt originall thereof ſignifieth Subſtance, and ſo ſaith Hierome *all ſchooles of humane learning underſtand it*: yet were it horrible blaſphemie thereupon to conclude, *Ergo in the matter of the Trinity it muſt ſignifie ſo too*; for *what mouth*, ſaith the ſame Father, *is ſo ſacrilegious as to ſay there are three Subſtances in the Trinity?* It is not therefore ſo much to bee marked whence a word is deriued, as what it is vſed to ſignifie; and if it ſignifie many things (as Faith doth) then muſt wee inquire in what ſenſe it is to be taken in the preſent queſtion, that ſo wee may build our doctrines not in the aery ſound of words, but in the vertue of the things ſignified, as *Baſil* ſpeaketh.

Anſt. πρὸ σοφ. ἐλεγχ. ca. 1.

Epiſt. 57. ad Damas.

Contrà Eunom. lib. 2.

Againe, words (as Logicians teach vs) haue their originations ſundry wayes, and among the reſt from the Effects. Not to ſeeke far for an inſtance; The third argument in a Syllogiſme whereby the Concluſion is proued, is by the Grecians called πίστις, that is Faith, a word as you ſay deriued from a verbe ſignifying to bee perſwa-

perſwaded: and yet I thinke your ſelfe will acknowledge that here it hath the name from the Effect, not becauſe it is Perſwaſion, but for that it doth beget Perſwaſion. Whereupon it followeth likewiſe that Faith in our Queſtion flowing from the ſame fountaine is not neceſſarily to ſignifie Aſſurance, but may well be called ſo becauſe by it euery true beleeuer may gather and conclude vnto himſelfe Aſſurance.

Laſtly, although the Greeke and Hebrew words whence Faith commeth ſignifie to bee perſwaded, yet they doe not only ſignifie ſo. For [illegible] as *Rabbi Nimbi* ſaith implies Affiance, and [illegible] in the middle voice imports as much, whence commeth [illegible] Confidence: and [illegible] (a word growing vpon the ſame root that [illegible] doth) conſtrued with the Prepoſition [illegible] ſignifieth to truſt, reſt, rely on. Wherefore the originall words in either language being indifferently affected vnto both, what reaſon can be rendred why faith in thoſe languages ſhould not as well beare the ſignification of Affiance as Aſſurance?

Theſe reaſons conſidered, you ſee at length the weakneſſe of your Achillean argument, and how inſufficient it is to perſwade that Faith is a Perſwaſion. Withall you may perceiue that if I would I might haue beene Philologos without any hazard vnto the definition of Faith which I maintaine: and that there is no cauſe why either you ſhould vpbraid mee with the odious name of Antipiſtos, or I feare incurring infamie for any thing hitherto I haue ſaid or written. Howſoeuer, ſure I am my Theologie agreeth better with true Philologie, then theſe virulent ſpeeches with the rule of Charity, or (to ſhew by the way what a skilfull Pedant you are) your

prepoſterous deduction of ~~ριζω~~ from ~~ανθρωπος~~ the Primitiue from the Deriuatiue, with the precepts of Grammer.

Treatiſe.

Bee not offended if I handle ~~καινα παλαιοις~~, and giue new tearmes to old matters.

N. B.

Ariſtoph. in Ran. & Lucian. in Pſeudoſophiſtâ.

You are no Conſtable, neither haue you put on the Lions ſkinne to ſubdue vs to your commaund. I tell you Maſter Downe *wee are offended that you giue new tearmes to old Poſitions, and handle them not onely* ~~καινως~~ *(which in this point you cannot bee permitted to doe) but alſo* ~~καινως~~ *which is vtterly intolerable. I will therefore ſay vnto you. With S.*

*Ep. ad Pammach. & Ocean.

Hieron, Cur poſt quadringintos annos docere nos niteris quod ante neſciuimus? How cõmeth it to paſſe that thou after 400. yeeres ſpace goeſt about to teach vs that before we knew not? *And ſo to you how dare you deale after a new manner in ſo waighty a thing as is Faith, oppoſing your iudgement to the iudgement of all the Church for theſe*

In Præſcript.

1600. *yeeres?* Alas *ſaith Tertullian,* quiceſtis vos, vnde, quando? who are you, whence are you, *and* of what

In Gen. hom. 3. lib. 3. ad Licent.

continuance? *But* ſuo ipſius iudicio perijt ſorex, *By ſhewing your ſelfe you periſh, as ſaith* Origen *and* Auguſtin *of others. Now perceiue wee that the iudgement of the whole Church cannot content you, but ſtill you muſt haue one inkhorne tearme or other of your owne to ſhew your itching eares. Would not or could not all the learned men of the world define iuſtifying Faith, and contenting themſelues with the Genus and Difference ſatisfie you, but that you*

would

would not onely dispute pro formâ *against them (which might bee in a Scholler for triall of wit tolerable) but also publikely preach against their iudgements, and proclaime them erronious, only allowing your owne for true.*

I. D.

Indeed, *M. Baxter*, it is true, I am no Constable: if I were I thinke I should finde it a very troublesome office to haue such a turbulent spirit within my iurisdiction as you are. And as for the Lions skin, as you say I haue not put it on: it is you that haue ietted vp and downe a long time in it, to the great scarring and affrighting of simple people. But becausse your vntimely braying and the vnlucky appearance of your eares now bewray that it growes not to your backe, you must be content to bee stript of it, and to walke hereafter as you are in your owne hide. Æsop.

You are offended, you say, *that I giue new tearmes to old positions, and handle them now after a new manner.* An offence not giuen, but taken, and therefore little to bee regarded. For the Philosopher, though he would haue the common vse of speech to bee retained in familiar conuersation: yet Artists, sayth he, haue liberty to inuent new tearmes, so as they bee proper, determined, and adequated to the thing signified. In regard whereof himselfe doubted not first to vse ποιότης for that which formerly in the Concrete was called ποιόν: neither was *Cicero* afraid with out former example to call that *Qualitas* which the Grecians tearmed ποιότης. In a word, how many tearmes are there now frequently vsed in schooles, which vnto the ancients were vncouth and ne-

Categ. c. 7. §. 16.

Simplic. super Prædicam. qual. Academ. Quæst. lib. 1.

uer heard of? It cannot therefore bee a ſufficient exception to ſay the tearme is new, vnleſſe with all you ſhew it is not proper enough to expreſſe the thing ſignified, which here you cannot doe, as by and by will appeare.

This I thinke you ſaw, and thereupon very reſtrictiuely you ſay that in this point I cannot bee permitted ſo to doe. And why I pray you not in this point as well as in others? For it hath alwayes beene the cuſtome of the Church of God euen in the higheſt points of Religion, partly for the clearing of thoſe parts that are obſcure and darke in them, partly for the preſeruation of them againſt the innouations of heretiks, to deuiſe new tearmes, and as *Athanaſius* ſpeaketh, *things vnchangeably remaining to change the names of things*. Hence the ancient Fathers inuented the word Trinity to ſignify the plurality of perſons in one ſubſtance, *Homouſios* to expreſſe the conſubſtantiality of the Sonne with the Father, *Theotokos* to maintaine the perſonall vnion of both natures in Chriſt, and ſix hundred ſuch like words vtterly vnknown vnto former ages: *old matters*, as the ſame *Athanaſius* ſaith, *receiuing new names & thoſe new names couching vnder them no new meaning*. According whereunto *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, though he would not haue his *Timothie* to broach new things, yet giueth him leaue to *teach the ſame things he hath learned after a new maner*. Being therfore warrãted both by the precept & practice of the Primitiue Church I ſee no cauſe but that euen in this point alſo I may be permitted to vſe new tearmes.

In diſp. cum Ario coram Probo Gentili iudice.

Ibid.

Cap. 18.

Perhaps you will ſay that not only the tearme wherewith it is inueſted, but the matter hereof is alſo new: for ſo much your queſtions out of *Hierome* and *Tertullian*, and the floud of words following with not a drop of reaſon

reason in them seeme to import. Whereunto though I haue already sufficiently answered, yet now I adde by way of surplus, that many Truths lye a long time hidden in their principles, and vnheeded of the wisest, which being at length disclosed and brought to light, are not therefore new in themselues, but onely vnto vs, comming newly vnto our knowledge: euen as the countrey of *America* is called the new world, not because it is of a latter creation then *Europe*, *Asia*, or *Africa*, but only because it is of a later discouery. These Conclusions vntill their dependency and coherence with the principles doe manifestly appeare vnto vs, it sufficeth to beleeue them implicitly and in the preparation of the Minde: but when they shall bee vnfolded out of their principles, and clearly demonstrated vnto vs by necessary deduction from them, we are bound to yeeld distinct and expresse assent vnto them. And then, as it would haue been great folly in the *Spaniard* to haue refused the gold and treasures of the new world, because it was found out not by the old *Argonauts*, but by *Christopher Columbus* a late sailer: so would it bee great sinne in vs to disclaime and renounce the benefit of a truth, because it is made known vnto vs, not by an ancient Father, but by a man of yesterday or to day. For this were to haue *the faith of God in respect of persons*, as *S. Iames* saith, and to restraine the gift of the Spirit of Wisdome and reuelation vnto the times of our predecessors, as if they only had eyes giuen them to spie out truths, and it were impossible for vs to see what they saw, not, although *wee caried the Sunne in our hands*, as *Lactantius* speaketh. Now then (to apply this vnto the matter in hand) if the point you quarell at bee not onely new vnto the present custome, as *S.*

Iam. 2. 1.

De Ciuit. Dei lib. 22. c. 7.

Auguſtin ſpeaketh, but alſo contrary vnto reaſon and the grounds of Faith, I confeſſe it is erronious, and iuſtly may you come vpon mee with your demaunds out of *Hierome* and *Tertullian*, *who are you, whence, when, that after 400. yeeres you ſhould goe about to teach vs what wee knew not before?* But if it bee new only vnto vs, and not in it ſelfe: then doe I anſwer your Hierome with Hierome, *Weigh not truth by time*; and Tertullian with Tertullian, *Nor ſpace of times, nor patronage of perſons, nor priuiledge of places may preſcribe againſt truth.* For that which is no otherwiſe new is true, and as the truth of God is with all reuerence and ſubmiſſion to bee embraced. Howbeit this I ſay not as if I would be thought to bee the firſt diſcouerer hereof, or that it had laine hid as it were in the pit of *Democritus* vntill this time. For that there is a Faith (whoſe obiect is the Perſon of the Mediator) was neuer yet vnknowne in the Church, but hath euer beene manifeſt euen from the beginning. Search the Scriptures and you ſhall find therein nothing more cleere then this. For (as in the treatiſe ſent you I haue ſhewed) the whole tenor of them runs thus, *Hee that beleeueth in mee ſhall not periſh, yee beleeue in God beleeue alſo in mee: As many as receiued him to them hee gaue power to bee the Sonnes of God, that is to them that beleeue in him &c.* Whereunto I adde that in ſundry places it is expreſly called *the Faith of Ieſus Chriſt*, not becauſe it inhereth in Chriſt as in a Subiect, but for that it hath relation and reſpect vnto Chriſt as vnto the right Obiect.

Ep. 13. ad Paulin. De veland. virg. cap. 1.

Ioh. 3. 16. Ioh. 14. 1. Ioh. 1. 12. Rom. 3. 22. 26. Gal. 2. 16. 3. 22. Phil. 3. 9. Iam. 2. 1. Reu. 2. 13. 14. 12.

And that at length it appeareth, both that the matter is euery way old though the tearme bee new, and that new tearmes may bee giuen to old matters euen of this kind,

kind, so as they bee proper determined and adequated thereunto. It remaineth onely to shew that such is the tearme which here I vse. For proofe whereof I say no more but this, that if our best Diuines haue conueniently distinguished other Faiths according to their obiects, calling one Faith of story because Scripture story, another Faith of Promise because the Euangelicall Promise, a third Faith of Miracles because miracles are the proper obiect of them: I see no reason why I may not as freely and as fitly call that Faith of Person which hath for its Obiect the Person of Iesus Christ. Neither can I conceiue if this bee an inkhorne tearme as it pleaseth your elegancy to tearme it, why Faith of Story, Faith of Promise, Faith of Miracles should not be inkhorne tearmes also. But you are a very nice and dainty man, you can tast no wine how old or generous soeuer, vnlesse the cup out of which you drinke it bee grauen by *Myron* or *Polycletus*.

NOTE.

But this hath beene the course of all fanaticall spirits in all ages, moued with enuie, pride, ambition, selfe-loue, contention, hypocrisie, and couetousnesse, to condemne all others to set vp and stablish their owne fantasies. Read Augustine, *yea see the Ecclesiasticall histories*, Eusebius, Sozomen, Euagrius, Dorotheus, Vincentius &c. *there shall you see whereupon these Schismes in the Church began. Let mee therefore intreate you if you will needs deale in these grane causes* [illegible], *yet that you will deale also* [illegible] *well, as becommeth a wise man. For otherwise you shall bewray your mind desirous of nouelties, hazard your credit,*

Phil. 1. 14.

De Hæresibus ad Quodvult Deum.

credit, offend the Church, yea as hee saith take vpon you to glew an egge, loosing your labour, and making your selfe ridiculous to the best.

Diogenianus.

I. D.

What hath beene the course of fanaticall spirits in all ages, and whereupon they haue been moued to beginne their Schismes in the Church; I am not now to learne of you: neither needed you in this point so to flourish with your Greeke, or to make such a rumble with the names of *Eusebius, Sozomen, Euagrius, Dorotheus, Vincentius* and the rest. But what my inward motiues haue beene, and with what affection I haue proceeded in this businesse, God and my owne conscience are a sufficient theater: for your tongue is not the fanne of this floore. And seeing my earnest protestation in my preface cannot perswade your vncharitable heart to entertaine a better opinion of my sincere and vpright meaning in this cause, but that you will notwithstanding reckon me in the number of *fanaticall spirits, possessed with selfe-loue, contention, hypocrisie, and couetousnesse, condemning all others to set vp and stablish their owne fantasies*; I appeale vnto him who alone knoweth the heart and trieth the raines, and say vnto you in the words of S. Cyprian, *These things haue I written out of a pure mind and conscience, and with stedfast trust vpon my Lord and God. You haue my letters, I haue yours, in the day of iudgement both shall bee rehearsed before the tribunall of Christ.*

Ep. 69. ad Florent. Pupian.

Whereas you intreat me to deale in this graue cause well, and as becommeth a wise man, surely hitherto I haue indeuoured so to doe: how well I haue performed

it

it I leaue vnto the censure of the Church, and specially of those vnto whom the Spirits of the Prophets are subiect. In the meane season pardon mee if I feare none of those dangers you threaten vnto mee. How your selfe will auoid them I cannot tell, for neuer was there man wrote with lesse reason and more follie.

Treatise.

Three Faiths there seeme to be which lay claime and title to the priuiledge of iustification; Faith of History, Faith of promise, and Faith of Person. The first is an assent of the mind vnto the truth of Gods Word, and specially the Gospell. And this whether it bee Acquisite or Infused hath no interest in the matter of iustification. For besides that is absurd generall knowledge should iustifie----*

N. B.

That you dare bee so bold to make such a distribution of Faith I impute it to your desire of noueltie, as you say in the words last betweene vs debated. I tell you there is but one Faith, and that a true and liuely working Faith, and this onely is iustifying Faith, and comprehendeth your three nice distinctions, and is compounded of them all conioyned together, the first the beginning, the second the progresse, the third being the end. Eph. 4.

Knowledge the beginning, Application or Apprehension the Progresse, Rest the end of Faith.

I. D.

It is not desire of noueltie in mee, but loue of confusion in you, that dare not haue those things distinguished

which in their natures are diuided. For distinction of
Top. 1. c. vlt. that which is ambiguous, saith *Aristotle*, is the prime and most necessary principle both of defining and disputing well: the neglect whereof instead of profitable reasoning about matters of substance, induceth fruitlesse contention and iangling about words. Now that Faith is equiuocall and needeth distinction appeares first by reason, for that it comprehendeth vnder it sometime more and sometime fewer things, is both affirmed and denied of the same persons, is a word of accident attributed to diuers Subiects not contained vnder one next Genus, as to the Elect, to Reprobates, to Diuels. Secondly by authority, *It is one thing to beleeue a God, another to yeeld belief vnto God, another to beleeue on God*, saith
Ser. de temp. 181. Augustine. *There is a kind of gift equiuocally called Faith*,
In 1. Cor. 13. saith Oecumenius. *Not Faith of doctrines, but Faith of*
In 1. Cor. 12. *miracles*, saith Theophilact. *There is one Faith of Precepts, another of Signes, another of Promises*, saith Bernard. The same among the latter writers confesseth *Melancthon*, *Martyr*, *Kemnitius*, *Hiperius*, *Caluin*, *Vrsin*, *Foxe*, *Perkins*, and who not? Nay behold *Saul* himselfe also among the Prophets: for besides that anon you acknowledge Faith sometime to bee spoken abusiuely and by an equiuocation, you doe expresly both in your margent and text affirme that there are three kinds of Faith, and approue the same distribution which here you condemne in me.

For all this I tell you, say you, there is but one Faith, and that is iustifying Faith. Shall I now say vnto you as elsewhere you doe vnto mee, that you speake pure *Bel-*
De Iustif. l. 2. cap. 4. *larmine*? For indeed you vse the very language of that Iesuit. *Sectaries* (saith hee, vnderstanding Protestants)

are

are wont to distinguish three faiths, of history, of miracles, of promises: but Catholicks teach that they are one and the same Faith, and that iustifying Faith. But doth not the Apostle (in the place here quoted by you) auouch that there is but one Faith? yes verily: but thereby in the iudgement of the best Diuines hee meaneth, not that Faith whereby wee doe believe, but that which we doe believe: that is not the Habit but the Obiect of Faith, as if hee should more plainely say, *there is but one Christian Religion.* And although in regard of the variety and multitude of materiall obiects, there may seeme to bee not one but many Faiths: yet because the formall reason wherefore we doe believe them is but one, namely diuine testimony, and they are in such sort linked and wooven together that one Article cannot bee denied without the dissolution of the whole Creed, all being according to the old rule one copulatiue, it is therefore rightly and iustly called one Faith.

Finally where you say *Faith comprehendeth my three nice distinctions, and is compounded of them all*, I answer that such composition is altogether impossible: for Faith of Story, and Faith of Promise are in the Vnderstanding, but Faith of Person is in the Will, and it cannot be that one and the same Habit should bee subiectiuely in two seuerall faculties of so different natures. For the Habit that is for example in *Peter* is one in number and that which is one in number is indiuisible, and that which is indiuisible cannot bee at once in two Subiects, because as Philosophie teacheth Numeration is from the plurality of Subiects. This M. *Perkins* saw, and therefore saith, *Some doe place Faith partly in the Mind, partly in the Will, because it hath two parts, Knowledge & Affiance:* On the Creed.

but it ſeemes not greatly to ſtand with reaſon that one particular and ſingle Grace ſhould bee ſeated in diuers parts or Faculties of the Soule. And this alſo you cannot bee ignorant was anſwered in my treatiſe vnto the ſame obiection: which obiection I maruell how you can with modeſtie and credit mention, vnleſſe withall you were prouided to ſatisfie my anſwer. But ſeeing (as *Cicero* Verrin. 3. ſaith of *Hortenſius*) when you haue ought to ſay you haue not the power to hold your peace, it is an euident and ſtrong preſumption now that you ſay nothing, that you haue nothing to ſay.

N. B.

Bleare not the eyes of Gods Saints with your nicetie and falſities any longer, for thus you reaſon. No hiſtoricall Faith hath any intereſt in the matter of Iuſtification: But firmely to beliene the truth of Gods Word, and ſpecially the Goſpell is hiſtoricall Faith, Therefore firmely to beliene the truth of Gods Word and ſpecially the Goſpell hath no intereſt in the matter of Iuſtification. Good Sir I deny your Maior, which you thus endeuour to proue ab abſurdo & enumeratione partium, *No generall knowledge ſhall haue any ſtroke in the matter of Iuſtification, All hiſtoricall Faith is a generall knowledge, Therefore no hiſtoricall Faith hath any intereſt in the matter of iuſtification. Proue your Minor, which I denie, telling you moreouer that firmely to conſent to the truth of Gods Word in genere, and the Goſpell* in Specie *is not a Generall knowledge, but a Speciall knowledge, and therefore I argue. Such a ſpeciall* Mat. 13. 11. *knowledge of the Goſpell is the beginning of Faith Iuſtify-* Ioh. 17. 3. *ing. But firmely to conſent to the truth of Gods Word and* Mat. 16. 17.

the

the Goſpell is ſuch a ſpeciall knowledge: ex confeſſo. *Therfore firmely to conſent to the truth of Gods Word and eſpecially the Goſpell is the beginning of Iuſtifying Faith.*

I. D.

If you were as farre from hood-winking your owne eyes, as I am from blearing the eies of others, you might eaſily perceiue that now I deale againſt our common aduerſaries the Papiſts, and ouerthrow the iuſtification of their Hiſtoricall Faith, by the chiefeſt arguments which Proteſtants vſe. But you after the manner of thoſe Gladiators called *Andabatæ*, nor ſee nor care whom or what you ſtrike: and ſo mildly affected are you towards mee that ſo you may make ſome probable ſhew of endammaging or diſaduantaging mee, you reck not though through my ſides you reach and wound the beſt Diuines of our Church, yea and the common truth which wee all maintaine.

Neither doe I vſe ſuch circumguagues, nor wiredraw my arguments into ſuch a length as you beare vs in hand: but hauing nakedly and plainely defined what Hiſtoricall Faith is, I proue by two reaſons that Faith ſo defined doth not iuſtifie, the firſt whereof is this, becauſe it is *abſurd that ſo generall a Knowledge ſhould iuſtifie.* So that your *Ferio* Syllogiſme deſerues a *Ferula*, and vtterly to bee caſhed, as being no creature of mine, but an idle figment of your owne: and the next in Celarent (for ſo you forme it, although indeed it bee alſo in *Ferio*, the Minor propoſition and Concluſion notwithſtanding your generall notes being but particular enuntiations) is the onely Syllogiſme intended by mee,

and including my first argument. The Maior whereof it seemes you grant saying nothing vnto it: and the Minor only you deny, which I cannot but wonder at, seeing both the Minor and Conclusion are vniuersally vouched by all the Diuines of our side. The Conclusion is that Historicall Faith iustifies not: So saith Hyperius, *There is a certaine Historicall Faith whereby those things which are propounded in holy writ are simply beleeued: but yet is not applyed vnto Christ and the matter of our Saluation.* The Minor is, that Historicall Faith is a generall Knowledge: So sayth Kemnitius, *There is a certaine generall Faith which vsually is termed Historicall:* and againe, *Historicall Faith is a generall assent holding in generall that the promise of the Gospell is true.* And M. Perkins, *A generall Faith whereby they giue assent vnto the Gospell.* Neither doe I know any one of our Diuines that either in the Conclusion or the Minor doth gainsay them. So that by the iudgement of these men, both consenting to Gods Word in generall, and to the Gospell in speciall, is not a Speciall but Generall Knowledge: and if the Speciality of the Gospell being but a part of the whole Scripture did specify Faith, it would follow thereupon that there are as many Speciall Faiths as there are seuerall Articles of the Creed, which were vnreasonable to imagine. For that Faith which assenteth vnto the Gospell is no other then that which assenteth vnto the rest of holy Scripture: and although it may principally respect that part of diuine truth, yet doth it not only respect it, nor is limited thereunto as vnto the proper adequate obiect thereof, but vniuersally extendeth it selfe vnto all supernaturall reuealed veritics whatsoeuer. As for that Faith which our Diuines call Speciall,

De fide Hom. iustificandi.

Loco de Fide.

Ser. caus. c. 36.

Speciall, is to be vnderſtood of Faith of Promiſes wherby the Saints apply and appropriate them vnto themſelues, particularly and individually aſſuring themſelues of their preſent iuſtification and future ſaluation. And the ignorance hereof as I ween is the cauſe why you turne generall into ſpeciall and write of this matter ſo wildly and confuſedly.

This notwithſtanding very peremptorily you pronounce that *Hiſtoriall Faith is a ſpeciall Knowledge*, and thereupon Syllogiſtically inferre that it is the *Beginning of Iuſtifying Faith*: to what end I wot not well, vnleſſe it bee to proue that it doth iuſtify becauſe as you conclude it is the beginning of that Faith. But whatſoeuer your intent bee, your argument I anſwer by diſtinguiſhing of the word Beginning. For if you vnderſtand thereby a Pre-requiſite or Preparatiue vnto iuſtifying Faith, you doe but fight with a ſhadow, for in that ſence I grant the Concluſion, neither doth ſuch a beginning of Iuſtifying Faith iuſtify. If you meane thereby that it is Iuſtifying Faith inchoat and in a remiſſer degree, then I deny your Maior, and ſay that ſuch a knowledge (call it as you pleaſe generall or ſpeciall) is not the beginning of iuſtifying Faith; If it were, then Diuels and Reprobates hauing it ſhould haue iuſtifying Faith which Gods Word attributes vnto the Elect onely. And if it Tit. 1. 1. bee true that Faith of perſon is the conſummation of Iuſtifying Faith as in the former ſection you ſay, it cannot bee that ſuch a knowledge ſhould bee the Beginning thereof: vnleſſe you will ſay that Accidents may paſſe from one Subiect to another, which is againſt all Philoſophy. For Hiſtoricall Faith is in the Vnderſtanding, &c. and Faith of Perſon is in the Will: and therefore Faith

of

of Story beginning in the Mind can haue no ſubſiſtence elſewhere, and iuſtifying Faith being perfected in the Will cannot bee begunne in any other Subiect. The paſſages quoted in the margent though you ſhould rack them till they rent aſunder, yet will they not confeſſe what you alledge them for. For how I pray you hang theſe things together? *To you it is giuen to know the myſteries of the Kingdome of heauen; This is life euerlaſting to know thee; Fleſh and Bloud hath not reuealed this vnto thee but my Father*, Ergo *Such a knowledge is iuſtifying Faith begun.* This is too violent aſtraining of Scripture, and as *Voluſian* ſpeaketh, *is not a ſucking of milke, but drawing of bloud from the dugs of the Church.* As for the Minor I haue already ſufficiently demonſtrated the falſhood thereof: only it ſeemeth ſtrange why you ſhould take it as confeſſed. For ſure I am in expreſſe tearmes I haue affirmed the contrary: neither can I gueſſe of what words you gather it, vnleſſe perhaps of that I ſay and ſpecially the Goſpell, which were too ridiculous. For that indeed confeſſeth the Goſpell to bee a ſpeciall part of Gods truth, but (not determining Faith onely thereunto) it doth in no ſort ſpecifie it, as is abouc fully proued.

Ep. 1. ad Nic. 1.

N. B.

Hiſtoricall Faith not diuided from the other two kinds, but ioyned with the, is cauſe of Iuſtification.

Againe I would pray you to ſpeake more learnedly, and argue ſoundly: For if you had ſaid formerly, No Hiſtoricall Faith only iuſtifieth &c. We had been agreed. For Hiſtorica Fides eſt cauſa iuſtificationis non ſolitaria ſed ſocia; non diuiſa ſed coniuncta. *But ſpeaking thus abſolutely you ſpeake vnlearnedly. Well, thus you proceed leaning your Minor naked and expoſed to the mercie of the World.*

I. D.

I. D.

Agreed, quoth you? Nay hee can hardly agree with mee that is at warre with himſelfe: and had I ſpoken neuer ſo learnedly, and argued neuer ſo ſoundly, yet I verily beliue you would haue quarrelled at it, becauſe I ſee you make contradiction of mee the onely rule of your ſpeeches. That there is but one Faith your ſay it is nouelty not to grant, and that, Faith only iuſtifies, I think you dare not deny: how is it then that in the margent forgetting your ſelfe you talke of three kinds of Faith, which except my Arithmetike faile mee are more then one? and ioyne fellowes with that in iuſtification in the body of your text, which yet you confeſſe doth onely iuſtify? But what is it that comes not within the ſphere of your omnipotent Philoſophie? The power of your Logicke hath already contracted Vniuerſall into Specyall: and why then may not the ſubtlety of your Metaphyſicke find a plurality alſo in an Vnity?

But to be plaine with you, I ſay that Hiſtoricall Faith is ſo far from being a ioint cauſe that at all properly vnderſtood of Iuſtification, but onely as I haue ſaid a Pre-requiſite or Preparatiue thereunto. True it is that Faith of Perſon is neuer Solitary, but is euer conioyned with ſundry other graces, and among the reſt with Hiſtoricall Faith: yet are not their operations to bee confounded, becauſe in the ſame perſon they are conioyned. Many ſeeds lye in my hand together, yet euery one hath his ſeuerall and diſtinct vertue: Faith of Perſon is neuer without Faith of Story, yet it is Faith of Perſon which onely iuſtifies. And as in the generation of man, the

¶ Sensitiue soule goes before, and prepares a fit organ for the infusion of the Reasonable; and yet not the Sensitiue but the Reasonable only doth informe: so in the reparation of man, Faith of Story proceeds, and makes way * for the inducement of Faith of Person, and yet not Faith of Story but Faith of Person only doth iustifie.

Now whether in speaking thus absolutely I haue spoken vnlearnedly as you say or no, it skilleth not much, 1 Cor. 15. 9. seeing I am sure I haue spoken truly. What euer I am, by the grace of God I am, and desire so to bee vnto his glory. My want and inability I thanke God I know: yet know I no cause why in this mediocrity of knowledge and speech I should in comparison with you any whit disable my selfe. But sith as the Apostle saith, *knowledge* 1 Cor. 8. 1. *puffeth vp*, God grant vs both the spirit of humility, that denying our selues and all our learning, wee may be content to bee wholly captiuated vnto the obedience of the ¶ Faith of Christ.

The Minor which you say I left naked and exposed to the mercy of the world was this, that *Historicall Faith is a generall knowledge*, which indeed in my Treatise I did forbeare to confirme, not for want of sufficient proofes, but presuming that so euident a truth would neuer haue beene denied. But now I hope it appeares by what I haue aboue said to bee so well guarded with strength of reason and approbation of the learned, that henceforward it need not feare the rigor of your opposition.

Treatise.

Acquisite Faith the Diuels haue according to that of Saint Iames, *The Diuels beliene and tremble*: Infused Faith

Faith the Reprobates may haue, as *Balaam*, *Iudas*, *Magus*. Now iuſtifying Faith is proper to the Elect, and therefore hiſtoricall Faith cannot iuſtifie.

N. B.

O yee noble Scholliers marke this Syllogiſme: I haue made your arguments hitherto for you Maſter Downe, *and in this creeping and incroching argument tell you that you beg the matter in queſtion. For I deny that your definition of Hiſtoricall Faith is a generall knowledge, but ſpeciall and peculiar vnto the Elect in the beginning of their iuſtifying Faith, coniojned with the Application, and Reſting vpon Chriſt and his merits. And to bee plaine with you I tell you it is ridiculous yea blaſphemous to ſay that Diuels haue Faith, or that euer* Balaam, Iudas, *or* Magus *had Faith. And ſo telleth you M. Caluin*, Ridiculum erit ſi quis Diabolos habere fidem dicat, it is ridiculous for any man to ſay that Diuels haue Faith: *For* there is but one Faith, Eph. 4. *and the other is ſpoken* κατα χρησιν & ὁμονύμως, *abuſiuely and by an equiuocation, and is but a vulgar knowledge, or rather peculiar ſhew by miracles &c. as the ſame* M. Caluin *ſheweth right learnedly, and alſo telleth you*, Abundè conſtat totam hanc diſputationem de fide non haberi, *it is plaine that this whole diſputation is not about Faith. Let this therefore ſerue for an anſwer I pray you to your firſt diſtinction of Hiſtoricall Faith, which you confound with a vulgar knowledge as appeareth before: knowing this, No man that finally contemneth this Speciall knowledge of Gods Word and ſpecially the Goſpell can be ſaued. For hee can neuer haue the other two kinds of Faith ſpoken of before, except he begin with this kind of Faith.*

In Iac. 2. 19.

1 Cor. 13. 2. Calu. ibid.

I. D.

Surely I am very deeply beholding vnto your Maſterſhip, hauing ſo ſmall skill in Logicke, that you will bee pleaſed to forme my arguments, and to ſhape them in ſo excellent faſhion for mee. But I beſeech you ſpare your paines where you are like to reape little thanks for your labour. Such officiouſneſſe in an aduerſary is not without ſuſpicion: and if you may haue the hammering of my arguments, your weakeſt anſwers I doubt not will be proofe inough againſt them. Leaue me therfore I pray you to the meaning of my own weapons, and looke you well vnto your owne defence; for I feare mee you will hardly bee able to auoid the danger of them. For thus I reaſon, *That Faith which Diuels and Reprobates haue, iuſtifies not: Hiſtoricall Faith Diuels and Reprobates haue,* Ergo *Hiſtoricall Faith iuſtifies not.* Here you ſee no creeping, nor incroching, but faire and plaine dealing and ſuch as I am well content all noble Schollers marke it. But let vs ſee what you reioyne hereunto.

Firſt, you ſay, I beg the matter in Queſtion. What matter? that Hiſtoricall Faith is a generall knowledge; but neither is that the matter now in Queſtion, neither doe I any way beg it. For in this Syllogiſme the Queſtion is, whether Hiſtoricall Faith doe iuſtify, of your Queſtion there appeares not palme nor footſtep: which yet in the former ſection againſt your negatiue I haue proued to bee moſt true. That which you adde if it bee not ſenſeleſſe is contrary both to your ſelfe and vnto reaſon. For ſaying that Hiſtoricall Faith is proper and ſpeciall vnto the Elect in the beginning of their iuſtifying Faith,

you

you plainely diſtinguiſh it from iuſtifying Faith, which is contrary to what you haue elſewhere ſaid. If you ſtill confound them and make Hiſtoricall Faith the beginning of Iuſtifying Faith, it is as if you ſhould ſay the beginning of iuſtifying Faith is ſpeciall and peculiar vnto the Elect in the beginning of their iuſtifying Faith, which is altogether witleſſe and ſenſeleſſe. Laſtly, to ſay that Hiſtoricall Faith which before was Generall and common as ſoone as it is conioyned with application and Reſting on Chriſt becomes ſpeciall and peculiar, is vtterly void of reaſon. For as Grace ſuperadded vnto Nature in the Elect makes not Nature ſpeciall and peculiar vnto them, but that ſtill it remaines common vnto all men: ſo alſo Hiſtoricall Faith by acceſſion of Iuſtifying Faith or Affiance changeth not its nature and becomes Speciall, but as it was euermore continues Generall. Generall I ſay, both Obiectiuely as ſtretching it ſelfe vnto all ſupernaturall reuealed verities: and Subiectiuely not being appropriated vnto the Elect onely, but commonly incident vnto others alſo.

Secondly you deny the Minor, telling mee plainely that *it is ridiculous yea blaſphemous to ſay that Diuels haue Faith, or that euer Balaam, Iudas, or Magus had Faith.* If I ſhould now temper my inke with ſome ſharper ingredient, and in the zeale of my affection ſay vnto you as the Angell ſometime ſaid vnto Satan, *The Lord rebuke thee*, it were no more then here you iuſtly deſerue. For it is not holy and learned men alone (which yet were too impudent) but euen the ſpirit of Wiſdome and truth himſelfe whom (I tremble to ſpeake it) you charge with ridiculouſnes and blaſphemie. For doth not the Holy Ghoſt by Saint *Iames* in expreſſe tearmes ſay, Iude 9.

Iam. 2. 19. *The Diuels beleeue and tremble?* and by Saint Luke, Act. 8. 13. *Then Simon himſelfe alſo beleeued?* and did not *Balaam* prophecying of Chriſt, and *Iudas* preaching Chriſt aſſent vnto thoſe truths wherewith they were illuminated? And what Orthodoxe Diuine is there ancient or moderne who falling vpon this queſtion doth not acknowledge that Diuels and Reprobates doe Hiſtorically beleeue? *Saint Auguſtine* is bold and compareth the Faith of Diuels confeſſing Chriſt, *Wee know thee who thou art, euen the Sonne of God*, with that memorable confeſſion of Peter, *Thou art the Chriſt the Sonne of the liuing God. This confeſſion*, ſaith hee, *was fruitfull vnto Peter, but pernicious vnto the Diuels, yet in both not falſe but true, not to bee denied but acknowledged, not to bee deteſted but approued.* And a little after hauing vouched that of *Saint Iames*, the Diuels beleeue and tremble, and compared therewith the Faith of thoſe who beleeue the truth of God but liue wickedly, *Behold*, ſaith hee, *Wee haue found out of the Church not onely certaine men, but Diuels alſo confeſſing the ſame Faith of one God, yet both confirmed by the Apoſtles rather then denied.* Of the ſame iudgement are our latter writers, *That Faith is attributed to Simon Magus*, ſaith Caluin, *We vnderſtand not with ſome that hee fained in words a Faith which was not in his heart, but thinke rather that being ouercome by the Maieſty of the Goſpell, hee did in a ſort beleeue and acknowledge Chriſt to be the Author of Life and Saluation. Simon*, ſaith Beza, *beleeued with Hiſtoricall Faith. Hiſtoricall Faith*, ſaith Perkins, *is in the Diuell and his Angels. Such a Faith*, ſaith Fulke, *as is in Diuels, namely an acknowledging that there is one God, and ſo likewiſe of all the reſt of the Articles of Faith to bee true, without truſt or confi-*

De vnico Bapt. cont. Petil. c. 10.

Inſt. lib. 3. ca. 2. §. 10.

In Act. 8. 13.

On the Creed.

Anſ. to Rhem. T. in Iam. 2. 6.

dence

dence in God. Finally, the whole Church of Auſpurg, *Whereas Saint Iames ſaith, the Diuels beleeue and tremble, hee ſpeaketh of an Hiſtoricall Faith: Now this Faith doth not iuſtifie, for the Diuels and the wicked are cunning in the Hiſtory.* Which laſt words I would wiſh you to note and obſerue. For if Hiſtoricall Faith bee no other then an aſſent of the Mind vnto the truth of Gods Word, then Diuels and Reprobates ſo aſſenting, yea being cunning in the Story, muſt needs haue Hiſtoricall Faith. Adde hereunto, that if they doe not ſo much as Hiſtorically beleeue, then the ſinnes which they commit againſt the Goſpell are onely ſinnes of ignorance and not againſt knowledge, neither can they offend of malice, or fall into that vnpardonable ſinne which is againſt the Holy Ghoſt. Neither laſtly can any bee ſaid to haue *made ſhipwracke of Faith*, which yet the Scripture ſaith ſome haue done, vnleſſe perhaps you will ſay a man may make ſhipwracke of that which hee neuer had. So that now if I haue ſpoken ridiculouſly and blaſphemouſly as you ſay, you ſee what Schoolemaſters haue deceiued me, and vpon what reaſons I haue been drawne into this folly and impiety: or rather the world ſees what folly it is in you thus againſt all reaſon to impute *blaſphemy and ridiculouſneſſe* vnto the truth of God, and the moſt glorious preachers and defenders thereof.

Harm. Confeſſ.

Mat. 12, 32.

1. Tim. 1. 19.

Yet *Caluin*, you ſay, telleth mee it is *ridiculous to ſay that Diuels haue Faith*, and, it is *plaine that this whole diſputation Iam. 2. is not about Faith.* But is it poſſible that *Caluin* ſhould ſtriue againſt the torrent of ſo maine authority? or like the Philoſopher of whom *Ariſtotle* ſpeaketh forget his owne voice, and vnſay that which he had formerly ſaid? Certainly if you wil giue him leaue to

bee

bee the interpreter of his owne meaning you ſhall find hee doth not. For when hee denieth that Diuels haue Faith, and that *Saint Iames* there diſputeth of Faith, hee vnderſtandeth not Faith indefinitely, but particularly iuſtifying Faith. This is euident by his annotation on the twentieth verſe, *Here*, ſaith hee, *is no diſputation of the cauſe of Iuſtification*, whereby what other can hee meane then Iuſtifying Faith? And when hee ſaith *the diſpute is not about Faith*, hee addeth forthwith, *but of a vulgar knowledge which conioyneth a man to God no more then the ſight of the Sunne liftes him to Heauen.* Now what is that Faith which vnites vs vnto God, but onely Iuſtifying Faith? and what is this vulgar knowledge other then Hiſtoricall Faith, by which the eye of the mind ſees diuine truth as that of the body ſees the Sunne? Of that therefore by *Caluins* iudgement Saint *Iames* ſpeaketh not, of this hee doth. And *Beza* who vpon this place treadeth in *Caluins* ſteps and well knew his meaning affirmeth that Saint *Iames* vnderſtandeth not the ſame Faith whereby Saint *Paul* ſaith wee are iuſtified, but onely that whereby wee doe belieue there is a God, and that Chriſt is the Sonne of God, and that all things preſcribed in both the teſtaments are true, which is in effect the very definition of Hiſtoricall Faith. But for all your prayſing of *Caluin*, you cannot bee contented with his expoſition, but you muſt needs haue a tricke beyond him. For whereas hee by Saint *Iames* his Faith vnderſtand a *vulgar knowledge*, you will rather haue it to be *a peculiar ſhew by miracles*, which is the moſt ſenſeleſſe deuice that euer was imagined. For who euer dreamed that the Queſtion which there the Apoſtle diſputeth ſhould bee this, *Whether a peculiar ſhew by miracles with-*

In Iam. 2, 20.

Beza in eundem locum.

without works doe iuſtifie? And when hee ſaith *Thou beleeueſt there is one God, thou doeſt well; the Diuels beliue alſo and tremble*, what brute of *Cuma* or *Arcadia* would expound it thus, *Thou haſt a peculiar ſhew by miracle, it is well, the Diuels haue a peculiar ſhew by miracles alſo and tremble?* Learne therefore and know that the Faith which Diuels haue, cannot bee Faith of miracles: for miracles the Diuels can worke none, being limited within the compaſſe of their nature which cannot produce ſupernaturall effects, and neuer being ordained to bee the confirmers of Faith, to which end miracles were appointed. Now then to end this point, whereas you pray this may ſerue for an anſwer vnto my firſt diſtinction of Hiſtoricall Faith, I muſt tell you plainly that what you cannot win by force, you are not like to get by begging; neither can I at any hand bee intreated to accept of friuolous and deſperate ſpeeches, for ſound and ſubſtantiall anſwers. Whereas againe you make the ground of my error as you pretend to bee *confounding of Hiſtoricall Faith with a vulgar knowledge*, You ſhall by your patience giue mee leaue ſtill to erre that error, vntill by ſome new-found nicetie you can diſtinguiſh them, whereof I pray you let vs heare by the next. Laſtly, where you wiſh mee to *know that whoſoeuer finally contemneth Hiſtoricall Faith cannot haue the other two kinds of Faith, nor bee ſaued*, I doe you to weet that I know it right well, but what you intend or would inferre thereon nor I nor I thinke your ſelfe know. Some thing was to be ſaid to make a ſhew and to fill vp paper: but what and how pertinent it is, *Hippoclides* cares not.

I Treatiſe.

Treatise.

The second is Faith of Promise and is a Perswasion or Assurance that the Promises of God made in Christ, to wit iustification, remission of sinnes, adoption, regeneration, finally Election it selfe and eternall saluation doe particularly pertaine vnto mee and are mine; Yet this iustifies not.

N. B.

And I confidently hold that a firme and finall perswasion, application and assurance that the promises of God made in Christ to wit Iustification, Remission of Sinnes, Adoption, Regeneration, and Election it selfe, and eternall Saluation doe particularly belong vnto mee and are mine, is that which iustifies a man before God. You deny it, and thus you oppose.

I. D.

Vnto my assertion you oppose only your simple contradiction, preparing your selfe immediately to answer my arguments. But because in my Treatise certaine words are premised before my reasons, wherein you cauill after your confused manner in a very importune and vnfit place: I will by your leaue rectifie what you haue disturbed, and maintaine them there where my owne method first ordered them.

premised

Treatise.

This Faith of Promise although I deny not but in Scrip-

Scripture it is called Faith, and that euery Saint of God both may and ought to haue particular perſwaſion and Aſſurance: Yet I confidently deny that this Perſwaſion and Aſſurance is that which iuſtifies a Man before God.

N. B.

A man may bee ſaued by this Faith, yet this Faith is not a iuſtifying Faith, therefore a man may bee ſaued without a iuſtifying Faith. Whoſoeuer may bee ſaued by this Faith, and by your third kind of Faith may bee ſaued by two kind of Faiths, the one iuſtifying, the other not iuſtifying, which is abſurd. Yet by your confeſſion M. Downe, *a Chriſtian ought to haue this Faith as of neceſſitie. Then if hee ought to haue it hee cannot bee without it, and yet may ordinarily be ſaued without it as you ſay, and ſo ſaued without that which hee ought of neceſſity to haue to ſaluation: and alſo ought to haue that to ſaluation which will doe him no good to ſaluation becauſe hee may bee ſaued without it. What abſurdities and contrarieties be theſe?*

I. D.

Now alas were I as cunning as *Theſeus* himſelfe, how could I winde my ſelfe out of theſe perplexities and labyrinths wherein you haue intangled mee? or were I as ſtrong as *Samſon* how could I breake in ſunder theſe cords of *abſurdities* and *contrarieties* wherewith you haue ſo faſt bound mee? And yet when I looke more neerely vnto the matter, mee thinks the knots are not ſo intricate that there needs *ſome God from the engine*, (as it is in the Prouerb) to vntie them. For as Auguſtin

ſaith, *Doe but reſtore my words, and your calumniation will preſently vaniſh.* All I ſay is no more but this that euery Saint of God both may and ought to
** haue particular aſſurance and perſwaſion: you report mee to ſay: A man may bee ſaued by this aſſurance, and that he ought to haue it as of neceſſity to ſaluation. Betwixt which ſayings there are as the Poet ſpeaketh many high hils and deep ſeas: and therefore what iars or diſcords ſoeuer you haue here found, is in the ſong of your owne ſetting and not of my deuiſing. For what mad Syllogiſmes are theſe if inſteed of your imaginary propoſition you reſtore my true aſſertion, and then adde vnto it your Aſſumption and Concluſions, thus; *A man may and ought to bee aſſured, But Aſſurance is not iuſtifying Faith*, Ergo, *a man may bee ſaued without a Iuſtifying Faith*, Ergo, *a man may bee ſaued by two kinds of Faith*, Ergo, *hee may bee ſaued, without that which hee ought of neceſſity to haue to ſaluation*, Ergo, *hee ought to haue that to ſaluation which will doe him no good to ſaluation*: Doe you not ſee that againſt the canons of Logick, firſt, you haue one tearme in the concluſion, namely may bee ſaued, which is not found in either of the premiſſes? Againe, that neither tearme of the Concluſion is in the Maior propoſition? And laſtly, that the Concluſion is affirmatiue notwithſtanding that the Aſſumption is negatiue? Fie, fie that a Logicke-wright ſhould ſo much ouerſhoot himſelfe, and ſo ſhamefully tranſgreſſe his owne precepts. This infamy (to retort vpon you your owne words) had you not incurred, if you could haue abſtained from peruerting my ſpeeches, and adding vnto them ſuch impudent gloſſems of your owne.

But yet when I ſay a man ought to haue Aſſurance, doe

doe I not therein confeſſe it to bee ſo neceſſary vnto Saluation that a man cannot be ſaued without it? Nothing leſſe, and God forbid that euery ignorance or doubting of what wee ought to know, ſhould preſently exclude and barre vs from Saluation; for then no fleſh poſſibly could bee ſaued. Although therefore when I ſay a man may bee aſſured I confeſſe a poſſibility, and when I ſay hee ought to bee aſſured I acknowledge a dutie: yet doth it not follow thereupon that ſuch aſſurance is of abſolute neceſſity. Neceſſary it may bee vnto the well-being of the Sonne of God, but not vnto his Being, as if hee could not bee a new creature without it: neceſſary to cheere and ſolace him in the way to the end, but not vnto the end it ſelfe, as if without it hee could not aſpire vnto ſaluation. Such abſolute neceſſity of aſſurance vpon paine of damnation I know none, ſaue onely of thoſe truths which wee call fundamentall, among which I ſuppoſe your and my iuſtification and ſaluation are not to bee reckoned. And yet had I ſaid (which I deny) that *Aſſurance is neceſſary vnto Saluation*, what inconuenience is it to ſay that neuertheleſſe it is not neceſſary vnto iuſtification? For Saluation is the End, Iuſtification a meane or way vnto the End, and more things are ſubordinate vnto the end, then vnto the way: as vnto Saluation both Faith and workes are neceſſary, but vnto Iuſtification Faith alone is required. And therefore alſo it is no abſurdity to ſay that two Faiths are requiſite vnto Saluation, as indeed Faith of Story and Faith of Perſon are, although but one Faith iuſtify which is Faith of Perſon. And thus much for your plaine-ſong: now let vs heare your deſcant and diuiſion vpon it.

N. B.

Martiall. Emerepes apud. Apophth. Chryſippus.

Dij mentem tibi dent tuam Philæni, God ſend you your right wits to ſee theſe errors and to amend them. Μὴ παιδέρως τὴν μουσικὴν, Ne vities Muſicam ſaid one, Corrupt not muſicke, *ſpeake not contraries nor nouelties. You cannot alwayes ſaile in the night but at laſt will bee taken, if you were as craftie as a Cuckow, as ſpake* Pliny *and* Ariſtotle. *Wee hold in Diuinity but one Faith and not diuers in ſpecie, and that euery Chriſtian man is bound to haue it hauing meanes giuen him from God vpon paine of damnation, and that no man can ordinarily bee ſaued without it. And therefore doe caſt out your cobwebs, as following his counſell that ſaid* Vaſis eijcias quas nectit aranea telas, *knowing that your ſpeeches endeauour to mingle water and fire together, which is impoſſible to doe. Neither are your forces any thing able to deceiue Gods Elect, ſo long time trained vp in his bleſſed ſchoole. Well may you conſume your ſelfe as one ſaid* Comedo meipſum more Polypi, *I eat vp my ſelfe like* Polypus, *but the Church can you not deceiue, for your ſacke is full of Spiders as* Catullus *telleth one*, Nam tui Catulli Plenus ſacculus eſt aranearum. *The Church is no reed but the pillar of truth, and therefore it is hard for you to ſpurne againſt it.*

Athanaſ. in Symb.

Alcæus apud Athen. l. 7. Catull. Mat. 11. 1 Tim. 3. 15. Act. 9.

I. D.

Vnto this Rapſodie of ſentences and prouerbs drawn in like *Hercules* oxen, and tyed together like *Samſons* foxes ſo prepoſterouſly by the raiſes, were I a Grammar-ſchoole-boy againe, I would quickly patch you vp an anſwer

anſwer in the ſame kinde. But now I affect not an opinion of learning that way, deſiring as becomes a Diuine rather to bee reall then verball. If children either in age or vnderſtanding bee pleaſed with ſuch Pedanterie, and delight to ſee ſo many babies in your writing, I enuie it not, ſo long as the grauer and learneder ſort reſt contented and ſatisfied with the ſubſtance of my reaſons. Only vnto that charitable prayer which you make for me out of that deuout Poet Martiall, that *God would ſend me my wits againe*, I know not what kinder wiſh to oppoſe then that of *Horace* the deuouter Poet of the two, that you which are franticke and bedlem-mad would ſomething beare with thoſe who are but a little diſeazed and diſtempered. For indeed you are right twin vnto the Lunaticke gentleman in *Horace*, and as hee euery day viſited the theater and there ſate clapping his hands and leeping a ſtirreas if he ſaw ſome notable Tragedie acted before him, whereas the ſtage all the while was empty: ſo you here make much adoe, and tell mee of I know not what abſurdities, contrarieties, and nouelties, and yet the ground you lay for them is in my words no where to bee found. Whereſore as *Sophocles* being accuſed of dotage read before the iudges his *Oedipus Coloneus* which he had very lately compoſed, and then demaunded of them whether it ſeemed the poëm of a dotard or no: ſo becauſe you charge mee as bereft of my right wits and fraught with nothing elſe but errors and contradictions, I appeale vnto the Chriſtian reader, praying him to peruſe and ponder my treatiſe, and if hee pleaſe this Diſputation alſo, and then to iudge indifferently betwixt vs whether I bee as this *Feſtus* accuſeth me mad and beſide my ſelfe, or elſe with Saint *Paul* haue

Lib. 2. Sat. 3.

Cic. de Senect.

Act. 26. 24. 25.

haue ſpoken the words of truth and ſobernes.

Treatiſe.

1. *Arg.* If this were iuſtifying Faith, then whoſoeuer liues and dies without this particular Aſſurance cannot bee ſaued: *ſine Fide* &c. without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God. But a man may bee ſaued without it. *Ergo.*

N. E.

I hope you meane de adultis, *of men that haue meanes giuen them from God to get this Aſſurance: for otherwiſe I eaſily agree that God may extraordinarily ſaue whom it pleaſeth him. But doubting not of your meaning, and denying your Minor, you take vpon you to proue it, firſt by an inſtance, and next by ſix reaſons: All which let vs ſee.*

I. D.

Epiſt. 57. Taking me to meane *de adultis*, you doe no whit miſtake mee: for as *Auguſtin* ſaith, that *Infants know the things of God who know not ſo much as the things of men; if wee ſhould goe about by words to demonſtrate, I feare mee wee ſhould bee iniurious euen to our very ſenſes, endeauouring to perſwade that by ſpeech, the euidence of whoſe truth ſurpaſſeth all faculty and office of ſpeech.* Neuertheleſſe becauſe it is written *without Faith no man can pleaſe God*, and, *the iuſt ſhall liue by his owne faith*, many learned men haue hereupon conclude that Infants haue a Faith euen of their owne: in ſo much that *Beza* though of a different iudgement confeſſeth this to bee a very ſolid

Ad 8a Colloq. Mompelg. Reſp. de Bapt.

and

and firme foundation, and ſoone after addeth, that of this matter very learned Diuines, yea and the ancient Fathers alſo differ in opinion: *for this Queſtion*, ſaith he, *is among the number of thoſe wherein becauſe wee all know many things but in part wee may vary in iudgement, and yet the foundation of orthodoxall Faith ſtand ſafe.* But you take it I meane *de adultis*, and as I haue ſaid you doe not miſtake mee, and therefore you deny my Minor: which when you ſay I proue by an inſtance and ſix reaſons, it ſeemes you paſſed ouer my reaſons perfunctorily and without attention, or cared not to let drop of your pen at aduenture whatſoeuer came next to head. For I proue the Minor by one inſtance onely, and the arguments following are no more but fiue; and conclude not the Minor but the maine Queſtion, to wit, that Aſſurance doth not iuſtify: The inſtance is this.

Treatiſe.

I inſtance in thoſe our Brethren of Germany who hold that Faith may totally and finally fall away, and conſequently that there can bee no certainty of Saluation, whom yet the Church of God calleth and counteth Brethren, and it were vncharitable to cenſure of them otherwiſe. Therefore (or at leaſtwiſe probable) Faith is not an Aſſurance.

N. B.

Whatſoeuer our Brethren of Germany hold is true, but they hold that a man may be ſaued without this Faith, Therefore this poſition is true. O hominis acumen & argumentum lepidum! *What mood and figure I pray you was this*

Syllogiſme borne in? But proue your Maior, for we haue learned Chriſt otherwiſe then to tie our Faith vnto the opinions of any one particular Church. Yea this argument ſauoureth mightily of Popery, which I thought you had beene as far from as I know you are in this point from Chriſts verity and Chriſtian vnity. For why I pray you might I reaſon thus as you doe to proue that works doe iuſtify a man before God, and merit eternall life. The Church of Rome holdeth ſo, Ergo, *the Poſition is true?* Ob. *But you will ſay they are no Brethren:* A. *I anſwer they bee the Church of God if wee believe* M. Caluin *and* M. Bunny *citing this place Antichriſt ſitteth in the temple of God: But hee ſitteth at Rome, Therefore Rome is the temple of God. But I pray you let vs not bee bound to defend the errors of our Brethren, neither too haſty to diſcouer them. And that this opinion is an error let the whole courſe of the Scripture declare. Whoſoeuer liueth by Faith liueth for euer, But the Saints of God liue for euer, Therefore they liue by Faith for euer. All the gifts of God be without repentance, Faith is the gift of God, Therefore without repentance. That which continueth vnto the end and is made perfect cannot finally fall alway, But Faith continueth vnto the end and is made perfect, Therefore it cannot finally fall away. See what the Fathers ſay,* Neque fides vera eſt ſi non ſit perpetua, ſed poſſit deficere, *Neither is Faith true Faith except it bee perpetuall and cannot fall away.* Credere verè eſt credere inconcuſſè, firmè, ſtabiliter, & fortiter: *To believe truly is to believe without wauering, firmely, ſtedfaſtly, and ſtrongly.*

Ep. Tract. of Pacif.

Dari. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Perficiet vſq; ad finem bonum Phil. 2.

Fides eſt opus Dei. Ioh. 6.

Ambr. 2. Cor. 6.

Aug. in Ioh. Tract. 106. col. 513.

I. D.

There is a little triobolar pamphlet commonly called

called *Baxters* Logicke, the Authour whereof I thinke you eſteeme as ſkilfull in that Art as euer was *Zeno* or *Ariſtotle* himſelfe. Though I could neuer find in my heart to looſe an houre or twaine in peruſing it, yet I perſwade my ſelfe no man can better reſolue you in what mood and figure this Syllogiſme was borne. But if not ſatisfied herewith you will needs know my opinion alſo, thus I thinke without all figure it was borne in a peeuiſh mood. For it is farre from my thought and purpoſe to maintaine that *Whatſoeuer our Brethren of Germany hold is true*, or that *Faith once infuſed can either finally or totally fall away*: and if you were not either deſperately impudent, or brutiſhly ignorant, you would not ſo haue forced my words, and obtruded ſuch vnreaſonable reaſons vpon mee. For thus I argue, *Our Brethren of Germany may bee ſaued, yet they haue not this Aſſurance*, Ergo, *ſome that haue not this Aſſurance may bee ſaued.* The Maior is grounded vpon the iudgement of Charity, and the cenſure of Gods Church calling and counting them Brethren. Such is the iudgement of *Beza*, *Sadeel*, *Iewel*, *Whitaker*, *Reinolds*, *Perkins*, and whoſoeuer is borne within the temperate zone of Chriſtian loue, and not vnder the burning region of intemperate zeale, or frozen climate of vncharitableneſſe. The Minor is thus proued, becauſe they hold that *Faith may finally and totally fall away*. For whether this Poſition bee true or falſe is not materiall in this place: onely if they hold ſo, as queſtionleſſe they doe, then can they not bee aſſured, which is my Aſſumption. For to bee certaine of Saluation, and in poſſibility of damnation are incompatible and cannot ſtand together.

Epiſt. 2. ad Dudith. Poſnan. Aſſert. conf. in notâ vnitatis. In Apol. and Defence of Apol. De Eccleſ. q. 5. c. 8. In theſi 5. On the Creed.

Theſe things being ſo, to what end take you ſo much

paines to ſhew that *it is not alwayes true which ſome one Church holdeth*, troubling the Reader with your needleſſe Obs and Sols.? and why doe you alledge ſo many Scriptures to proue that Faith cannot faile, a truth I neuer doubted of? For herein you doe but plow the Seaſhore, and let flie at *Sempronius* when it was *Titius*, that ſtrake you. Neither is it a matter of any hardneſſe or difficulty to refell the moſt of your arguments if I would ſpend time and oyle about it; for like a bungling workman you haue marred a good cauſe with ill handling. For example (to giue you a little taſt of your weaknes this way) that *wee are not to tie our Faith vnto the opinions of any particular Church* you proue, becauſe the contrary *ſauoureth mightily of Popery*. And yet Popery teacheth not that a particular Church cannot erre, nay doth not define that the particular Church of *Rome* cannot erre, but only alloweth that priuiledge vnto the Catholicke or Vniuerſall Church. Againe, to proue that Faith cannot finally or totally fall away thus you reaſon, *Whoſoeuer liueth for euer liueth by Faith, But the Saints of God liue for euer, Therefore they liue by Faith for euer*. May I not now in requitall of your ſcoffing exclamation crie out *O hominem obtuſum & argumentum ſtupidum!* For firſt you conclude that the Saints liue by Faith, which is not the point in queſtion. Secondly you haue one tearme in the Concluſion not found in the premiſſes, namely *liue by Faith for euer*, and ſo your Syllogiſme is a meere Paralogiſme. Laſtly, if to perfect vp the Syllogiſme you vnderſtand the Maior Propoſition thus, *Whoſoeuer liueth for euer liueth by Faith for euer*, then doe I flatly deny it: for they that liue for euer liue onely in this life by Faith, in the life to come Faith ceaſeth,

ſeth, and then they liue by viſion, not by Faith. But I forbeare further to examine either theſe or the reſt of your arguments, partly becauſe wee agree both in the generall Concluſions, and partly leſt I proue as wiſe as he, who while his fellow was milking a ram-goar, held a ſiue vnder to receiue the milke. Demonax apud Plut. Apoph.

N. B.

But you ſay the German Church holdeth it: I deny it, neither can you be able to ſhew it, and therefore it is a great ſinne thus to traduce the fame of ſo honorable Perſonages. Three and thoſe no ſmall lights in the Church of God I will ſhew which hold the contrary, and ſo leaue you to the Spirit of God who worke in you conuerſion. Luther *in the place before, ſaith*, Veri auditores ſunt qui Verbum Dei perpetuò retinent & fructum adferunt: *They bee true hearers which hold faſt alwayes the Word of God (which none can doe without Faith) and bring forth fruite.* Brentius *ſpeaking of* time-ſeruers *faith* that they did neuer truly beliue, *Bucer calleth that Faith which may be loſt* imaginem fidei & ſimulatam credulitotem, *an image of faith and counterfait credulity. Now you haue heard theſe great Fathers of Germany againſt you, with what face can you accuſe ſo indefinitely the Brethren of Germany of ſo notable an error? But I will ſtay your leiſure to produce thoſe German-Brethren.* In Poſtill. maior in Seruages. in Euang. Luc. 8. de Semine. In idem, Euang. In ad Eph. c. 1.

I. D.

My leiſure ſhall you not long ſtay for. *That many doe not perſeuere but fall from grace, both Scripture and experience teacheth*, ſaith Kemnitius. *They that are moſt elected* Exam. parte 1. de Iuſtif.

elected may become Reprobates and therfore vtterly fall away, ſaith D. Andreas. *David was elected*, ſaith Heminginius, *yet indeed loſt the ſpirit, and was made guilty of eternall wrath vntill hee againe repented.* And againe, *As often as a ſinner*, ſaith hee, *although neuerſo enormious repenteth, of a veſſell of diſhonor and wrath, he is made a veſſell of honour and mercy: as on the contrary ſide whoſoeuer is a veſſell of honour and mercy, when willingly and wittingly hee fals into ſinne, hee waſts his conſcience, and looſing Faith becomes a veſſell of wrath and diſhonor.* The Century-writers, *That Faith once conceiued may be loſt and ſhaken out, it is plaine by ſundry examples and by the ſayings of Chriſt:* and, *that Faith may bee loſt the Apoſtles both by their ſayings, and examples doe demonſtrate.* Finally, the whole Church of Saxonie, *It is manifeſt that ſome that are regenerate doe grieue and ſhake off the Holy Ghoſt, and are againe reiected of God, and made ſubiect to the wrath of God, and eternall puniſhment.* Read *Zanchie* in his Miſcellanies, and there ſhall you find how much trouble that that worthy man ſuſtained in Germany among other things for gainſaying this point. For indeed this is one ſpeciall Article wherein wee and the Lutherans (for them I vnderſtand by Brethren of Germany) doe diſagree, and the ignorance thereof argues that you are little or nothing at all acquainted with the controuerſies that are betwixt vs and them.

Colloq. Mompelg. quæſt. de Bapt.

De gratiâ vniuerſali p. 26. lb. p. 30.

Cent. 1. l. 2. ca. 4. p. 275. & l. 1. c. 4. p. 120.

Harm. conf. incon. Sax. art. 10.

But you haue great Fathers of Germany againſt mee, and can ſhew *three no ſmall lights in Gods Church which hold the contrary*, euen *Luther*, *Brentius*, and *Bucer*. Firſt *Luther* was no *Lutheran*, and not holding all thoſe errors which thoſe who are called of his name defend, is not

not to bee reckoned among them: yet thus saith hee, *It is necessary to teach and know that when the Saints fall into manifest sinnes, as Dauid did, then Faith and the Holy Ghost are lost.* Brentius indeed was a rigid Lutheran, and therefore it is likly hee held as the rest of his fellowes doe, for certainty I haue none hauing not his writings by mee. Neither doth the passage you alledge out of him euince the contrary; for as Excutifidians (giue me leaue so to call them) distinguish, they that haue true Faith in the *trunesse* of *essence* or *existence*, may yet as they say want *true Faith* in the *trunesse* of *permanence* or *perseuerance*. As for *Bucer* hee fals not within the compasse of those whom I meane by the Brethren of Germany, for hee was none of those whom they call Lutherans. And yet as hee is alledged by *Zanchie* and others for the Perpetuity of Faith, so is hee vouched also by the contrary side for falling away from grace, as where hee saith: *They who sinne against conscience by no meanes haue a true and liuely Faith.* But suppose these three were such Brethren as wee speake of; yet what are they to *Kemnitius*, *D. Andreas*, *Hemingius*, *Illyricus*, *Wigandus*, *Matheus Iudex*, *Basilius Faber*, the whole Church of Saxony, and generally all Lutherans, who all hold as I haue affirmed? And therfore I do not as you say traduce their fame, nor accuse them wrongfully of error: they themselues haue diuulged and published it to the whole world in their books. And so my Assumption, that they haue not Assurance remaineth hitherto in his full strength and vertue.

In artic. smal. cald.

In Miscell.

In Colloq. Ratisb. pag. 247.

N. B.

You conclude vpon the premisses thus, Therefore or at least.

leaſtwiſe probably this is not iuſtifying Faith. Diſpute you poſitiuely, and conclude probably? Alas Maſter Downe, doe you preach after this manner at Cambridge to deliuer definitions by Sophiſtrie, when you ſhould ſpeake verè truly? It ſeemeth when you ſaid ſo you were not perſwaded that your doctrine was true, but determined contingently and probably with fine words to enſnare poore ſilly hearers. For when you ſay, Therefore or at leaſtwiſe probably, you doubted of the Truth thereof. Surely this is not to goe recto pectore with an vpright conſcience in Gods cauſe. But I hope wee ſhall take heed of you when you preach next, ſeeing you meane to tell vs the truth but only a probable tale. Σοφοὶ δικοδάμονες, A wiſe man will eſchew your ſnares. Bis enim ad eundem lapidem impingere ſtulto conuenit, ſaith Gregorius Theologus, It is the property of fooles to ſtumble twice at one ſtone.

Ammian. Marc. l. 17. Plutar. in collect.

Ep. ad Boſphor.

I. D.

Why Sir is it vnlawfull to conclude otherwiſe then Apodictically? or is it Sophiſtrie to vſe Dialecticall Syllogiſmes in matters of Diuinity? Certainly then much to blame are all thoſe Logicians who handle Topicall Syllogiſmes whoſe matter is contingent other where then among the Elenchs: and foully ouerſeene are all writers both ſacred and profane, ancient and moderne, who oftentimes diſpute probably, knowing that although Demonſtration only doe force and conſtraine, yet Probability doth very much bend and incline the minde. Saint *Auguſtin* did not ſo lightly eſteeme of Probable reaſons: for *Other writers*, ſaith hee, *I ſo read, that how much ſoeuer they excell in holineſſe and learning, I doe not therfore thinke any thing to be true becauſe they iudge ſo,*

Ep. 19. ad Hieron.

ſo, but becauſe they perſwade me either by thoſe Canonicall Authors, or by probable reaſon not abhorring from truth. Bellarmine vpbraiding Illyricus for his Coniectures is thus anſwered by learned Iunius, Bee not ſo hot I pray you againſt humane coniectures: In a word whether wee would modeſtly ſhew our owne opinion, or refell anothers, wee deale humanely ſaying it is a coniecture, but to vpbraid humane coniectures is meere inhumanity. Nay Daniel Chamier a very learned late writer in his booke de œcumenico Pontifice doth profeſſedly diſtinguiſh his arguments into Scripture, Coniecture, and Teſtimony: and will you therefore ſay of him as you doe vnto mee, that hee doubted of the truth of his cauſe, determined to enſnare poore ſilly Readers, and walked not recto pectore with an vpright conſcience? But ſo it is (I vſe the very words of D. Fulk being almoſt in the ſame tearmes cauilled withall by blundering Briſtow) When you can ſay nothing againſt my aſſertion your ſelfe, you would make mee vncertaine of it, and ſay that it is but a light ſuſpicion of mine, becauſe in one place before I come to the ſound proofe of it I ſay it is a probable coniecture. And doth it follow therefore that I doubt of it becauſe I offer a probable coniecture vnto other mens vnderſtanding before by order of diſcourſe I am brought to the manifeſt probation of it?

Contrà Bell. de tranſl. impl. 1. c. 11.

Dan. Cham. de œcum. Pont.

Reioinder to Briſt. reply.

Well yet if Probable like you not, thoſe that follow are Neceſſary, and I feare mee you will bee able to ſay little to them that leaue this without anſwer, and the weaker the argument the more diſgrace to bee graueld by it. But my purpoſe in vſing both, was for the more ſtrength and perſwaſion: for as Pindar ſaith, It is the ſureſt and ſafeſt way in a tempeſtuous night to caſt out of the ſhip two ankers.

Olymp. od. 6.

Treatise.

2. *Arg.* That which is in time after iuſtifying Faith cannot bee that Faith; This is vndeniable. But this Particular knowledge is in time after that Faith. This I proue out of 1 *Ioh.* 5. 13. Theſe things haue I written vnto you that beleiue in the name of the Sonne of God, that yee may know that yee haue Eternall life. Behold Beleiuing goes before and Knowledge comes after. As for that which followeth in the ſame verſe, and that yee may beleiue, I interprete it of Perſeuerance and growth in Faith. Howſoeuer Beleiuing and Knowing are here diſtinguiſhed, and therefore are not all one.

N. B.

I deny your Minor: neither doth that place of S. Iohn *helpe you ought as wee ſhall ſee anon. I tell you that iuſtifying Faith is a Particular Knowledge, though in other tearmes by vs vſed, and by the Scripture ſet downe. So that where you ſay, a man firſt beleiueth and then knoweth, wee ſay hee beleeueth, that is, hee particularly knoweth, apprehendeth, and applieth Chriſt to himſelfe perpetually and liuely to his ſaluation. So that Beleiuing and particular knowing himſelfe to bee elected are one: and that it is this knowledge thus I argue.*

I. D.

Before you come to beſtow a word or two vpon the Minor which you deny, you thinke it good like a cunning

ning and ſubtle diſputer flatly to deny the Concluſion, and peremptorily to auouch the Contradictory vnto it, & then very prodigally to waſt a multitude of words in the proofe thereof. A maruelous policy I promiſe you vtterly diſabling me from farther replying: for as much as Logicke it ſelfe giues no precept how a man may reply vpon him who denies the Concluſion, and taking the Contradictory thereof as granted goes about thereby to diſproue the Premiſes. For ſo doe you when you ſay Faith is a knowledge, and therefore goes not afore knowledge: my reaſon being contrarily framed thus, Faith goes before knowledge, therefore is not knowledge. Doubtles had you not had the heart of *Zenodotus*, and the liuer of *Crates*, as the Poet ſaith, you could neuer haue ſtumbled vpon ſo politicke a deuiſe. But let vs heare your reaſons. 4 Martial.

N B.

Whatſoeuer iuſtifieth a man is Faith: But particular knowledge iuſtifieth a man, Therfore particular knowledge is Faith. I proue the Minor out of the Scripture, By the knowledge of himſelfe, *ſaith the Lord*, ſhall my righteous ſeruant juſtify many. *Lo* M. Downe *here the knowledge of Chriſt iuſtifieth a man, and is the ſame in effect and working that Faith is, and therefore are they both one, which you make to bee twaine by diſtinction and originall. Your ſpeech helpeth* Bellarmine *that ſaith Faith may bee rather* in ignorantiâ implicitâ *in an ignorance couched, then* in explicitâ cognitione *a diſcouered knowledge.* Dari- j Eſa. 53. 11. Tom. 3. de iuſtif. l. 5. c. 7.

I. D.

Iud. 14. 18. Seeing here you plow with my heifer (as *Samſon* ſometime ſaid vnto the Philiſtines) how is it that you read not my riddle alſo? I meane hauing borrowed this Obiection from my Treatiſe, why take you not from thence the anſwer alſo? Surely that you vrge the one ſo eagerly, and ſo diligently ſuppreſſe the other, I know no cauſe but this you knew not how to reply vnto it: and therefore I will by your fauor repeate the ſame againe, vntil you find out ſome forcible reaſon to driue me from it. *The verbs of vnderſtanding and ſence in the Hebrew tongue ſignifie not onely the acts of them, but of the will and affections alſo. So* Pſal. 1. 6. *the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous: And, Depart, I know you not: And I will not heare, ſee, &c. that is, God will not ſo know, heare, ſee, as to loue, and approue. And ſo may I interpret that of the Prophet, Chriſt being ſo knowne as to bee embraced and reſted on by the will ſhall iuſtifie many.* Adde now, that it is neither neceſſary nor likely your Particular knowledge ſhould bee here ment: for the Obiect of the Prophets knowledge is no other then Chriſt, but the Obiect of your knowledge is your owne ſelfe, or, your preſent ſtate in grace and future Saluation. And what a ſenſeleſſe ſpeech doe you put into the mouth of the Prophet? for by your gloſſe it is as if hee ſhould ſay *My righteous ſeruant by making many to know that they are already iuſtified ſhall bring many vnto that which already they haue namely iuſtification.* But *Eſay* had in him both the Spirit of Wiſdome and the Tongue of Eloquence, and therefore pardon me if I cannot thinke he vſed to ſpeake nonſenſe like you.

Where

Where you ſay my ſpeech helpeth *Bellarmine* who ſaith Faith may bee rather *in ignorantiâ implicitâ*, in an ignorance couched, then in *explicitâ cognitione*, a diſcouered knowledge; Firſt, *Bellarmine* hath no ſuch words, neither I thinke did hee euer dreame of an implicit or couched ignorance. Of an implicit Faith we haue often heard, and of a rude and confuſed apprehenſion the Ieſuit in the place by you quoted ſpeaketh: but an implicit ignorance was neuer yet heard of, and what meaning it may haue for my part I cannot ſee. *Bellarmines* right words are theſe, *Faith is better defined by ignorance then knowledge*: which ſaying of his how my ſpeech helpeth I would you had taken a little more paines to make it manifeſt. For, whence and how you ſhould collect it I cannot tell, except perhaps it bee thus, *I ſay that Faith is not a knowledge*; Ergo, *I ſay alſo it is an ignorance*. I anſwer therefore ſecondly, that *Bellarmine* and I, ſpeake not of the ſame Faith, for hee ſpeaketh of Faith of Story, and I of Faith of Perſon: ſo that when I ſay Faith of Perſon is not a knowledge I cannot help him who ſaith Faith of Story is not a knowledge. For, as for Faith of Story you cannot bee ignorant that contrary vnto *Bellarmine* in my Treatiſe, I haue called it a Generall knowledge, ſo farre am I from defining it by ignorance with him. And yet I would haue you to know alſo, that when I ſay Faith of Story is a knowledge, I meane not thereby ſcience of Concluſions acquired and gotten by demonſtratiue proofe out of ſuch principles as are of themſelues knowne and euident. For how can a man by the light of naturall reaſon aſpire to the knowledge of that which is ſupernaturall and aboue reaſon? But I vnderſtand an explicit and diſtinct apprehenſion

De iuſtif. lib. 1. ca. 7.

henſion of the neceſſary Articles of Faith, oppoſite vnto that brutiſh ignorance which Papiſts call implicite Faith and Blind obedience: which diſtinct apprehenſion *Bellarmine* in the place before alledged denieth neceſſarily to bee required vnto Faith. Farthermore I would faine know how this followes, *Faith is not knowledge*, Ergo, *it is Ignorance*: for by the ſame reaſon you may conclude, Faith is not Hope, *Ergo*, it is Deſpaire; or thus, Earth is not fire, *Ergo*, it is water, and ſo by your creation all things in the world ſhall bee one of two, fire or water. But you ſhould remember that ſimple negation is poſitiue of nothing, and that Priuations are reduced vnto that ſubiect whereunto their Habits doe belong: whence it followeth that denying Faith to be in the Vnderſtanding and ſo to be knowledge, I deny it alſo to bee Ignorance.

Metaph. 12.

N. B.

Againe, whatſoeuer bringeth life eternall bringeth iuſtification and is Faith: But true knowledge of Ieſus Chriſt bringeth life eternall, Therefore true knowledge of Ieſus Chriſt bringeth iuſtification and is Faith. The Minor I proue out of the Words of Chriſt in S. Iohn, This is life eternall to know thee to bee the onely true Lord, and him to bee Ieſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent into the world. *The Maior is plaine, whatſoeuer apprehendeth that laſt which is life Eternall, apprehendeth the former, as election and iuſtification &c. But the knowledge of Chriſt apprehendeth eternall life, Therefore it apprehendeth iuſtification. But hence it followeth, whatſoeuer apprehendeth iuſtification is Faith, True knowledge of Ieſus Chriſt apprehendeth iuſtification, Therefore true knowledge of Chriſt*

Iohn. 17. 3. Mel. & Pez. Arg. Theol. p. 3. notitia Es. 53. ſignificat. non ſolum agnitionem perſonæ & beneficiorum Chriſti ſed etiam fiduciam quieſcentem in Chriſto ſicuti & Ioh. 17.

is

is Faith, and ſo conſequently and conuerſiuely Faith is knowledge, and this knowledge is Faith. And by this meanes Particular knowledge commeth not in time after faith, but is Faith, and is knowledge in the beginning, & in proceeding is knowledge, and in the end is knowledge. Ioh. 19. 25. Eph. 3. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 1 Cor. 13.

I. D.

The Maior of your firſt Syllogiſme that *whatſoeuer bringeth life eternall bringeth iuſtification* I deny. You ſay it is plaine becauſe *whatſoeuer apprehendeth the laſt ſuch as is eternall life, apprehendeth the former alſo which is iuſtification.* But firſt, what rule of Logicke allowes you thus to ſhift tearmes, and to turne bringing of life and iuſtification into apprehending life and iuſtification? For, howſoeuer you ſeeme to vſe them indifferently, yet are they words of different ſignifications, and therefore confounding them thus you make not ſo much the truth of the Maior plaine, as obſcure the meaning thereof. Againe, chuſe whether of theſe tearmes you pleaſe, yet is it palpably falſe that *Whatſoeuer bringeth or apprehendeth the laſt, bringeth and apprehendeth alſo the former.* Rhetoricke brings a man to ſpeake eloquently which is the latter: yet it is Grammar not Rhetoricke that brings a man to ſpeake *congruè* which is the former. Phyſicke brings a man to the faculty of curing diſeaſes which is the latter: yet brings not to the knowledge of the nature of things; for that belongs vnto the naturall Philoſopher, and according to the old ſaying, where the Phyſiologer ends, there the Phyſician begins. So alſo in diuine matters, Hope apprehends eternall life which is the latter, for it is the proper obiect about which it is occupied:

pied: it apprehendeth not iuſtification which is the former, for then by your rule it ſhould bee Faith it ſelfe, that being faith as you ſay which apprehends iuſtification. As therfore when diuerſe needles are by the Loadſtone trained one after another, the vertue of the ſtone moueth the firſt, the firſt the ſecond, and ſo of the reſt, but the third or ſecond is no way the cauſe of the dependency of the firſt: ſo in the concatenation of the cauſes of our ſaluation reckoned vp by the Apoſtle, to wit Election, Vocation, Iuſtification, Glorification, the former are mouers as it were vnto the latter, but not the latter vnto the former. The reaſon of all in a word is this, becauſe as I haue already ſhewed, more is required vnto the maine end, then vnto the ſubordinate meanes: and therefore ſeeing ſaluation is the end, Iuſtification the meanes, not whatſoeuer is requiſite vnto that is preſently neceſſary vnto this.

Rom. 8. 30.

The Minor that *true knowledge of Ieſus Chriſt bringeth eternall life*, I alſo deny. For Particular aſſurance (which is the knowledge you muſt here vnderſtand, or elſe you conclude not to the purpoſe) bringeth not eternall life, in as much as a man may be ſaued without it, as we haue already ſufficiently proued. Neither doe the words of Chriſt in *S. Iohn* verify your Minor: for by knowledge there he meaneth not your particular aſſurance and perſwaſion by which a man knowes he is iuſtified & ſhall be ſaued: but ſuch a knowledge of Chriſt and his Goſpell as is mingled with faith, and worketh our wils to accept of Ieſus Chriſt for our onely mediator. And this knowledge is ſaid to bee eternall life, not becauſe euery one that barely and nakedly knowes liues eternally (for as wee haue ſhewed Reprobates and Diuels haue Hiſtori-

Ioh. 17. 3.

call

call Faith) but partly, becauſe no man can liue without it, partly becauſe by it the Spirit of God worketh in the Elect that Faith by which they are iuſtified and ſo come to eternall life.

But what ſay I vnto the Minor deliuered in other tearmes, thus, *Knowledge of Chriſt apprehendeth eternall life?* I ſay firſt, it is not the ſame Propoſition, becauſe the tearmes are changed, neither are they equipollent. Secondly, I grant it to bee true, whether you meane by knowledge Dogmaticall Faith or Particular aſſurance: for by the one doe we apprehend that there is an eternall life, by the other that wee haue ſpeciall intereſt in it. Well then, if it apprehendeth eternall life doth it not follow that therefore alſo it apprehendeth iuſtification? No, by no meanes: for as wee haue aboue demonſtrated, it is not neceſſary that that which apprehendeth the latter ſhould apprehend the former alſo. And yet though I diſallow the conſequence, the conſequent I readily yeeld you, that Particular knowledge apprehendeth iuſtification: for ſo haue wee defined *Faith of promiſe to be a perſwaſion or aſſurance that the promiſe of God made in Chriſt, to wit iuſtification, remiſsion of ſinnes, adoption, regeneration, finally, election it ſelfe and eternall ſaluation doe particularly pertaine vnto mee and are mine.* What gather you now of this? *Ergo*, ſay you, it is iuſtifying Faith. How ſo? *Becauſe whatſoeuer apprehendeth iuſtification is iuſtifying Faith.* Nay contrarily whatſoeuer apprehendeth iuſtification it not iuſtifying Faith: for apprehenſion followeth iuſtification, no man apprehending himſelfe to bee iuſtified vntill hee be iuſtified, but Iuſtifying Faith is in nature before iuſtification, that being the cauſe and this the effect. And therefore vnleſſe

you will ſay that that which followeth is that which goeth before, you cannot ſay that that which apprehendeth iuſtification is that which iuſtifieth.

To conclude therefore neither is Faith knowledge nor knowledge Faith, but particular knowledge for ought you haue yet ſaid or can ſay commeth in time after Faith. But whereas finally you inferre that Faith is knowledge in the beginning, knowledge in proceeding, knowledge in the end, beſides that the foundation vpon which it is grounded is vntrue it is cleane contrary alſo to that which erewhile you affirmed, that *Faith is but one, compounded of my three nice diſtinctions, the firſt being the beginning, the ſecond the progreſſe, the third the end.* For the third is Faith of Perſon, and in the Will, and is by your confeſſion there the end of Faith, yet here you ſay faith is knowledge in the end: which things how they can ſtand together I ſee not, vnleſſe you will ſay that knowledge is in the Will and ſo confound the faculties and operations of the ſoule.

N. B.

In Ioh. 1. Ep. c. 5. to. 13. *The place of* Saint Iohn *by you cited to proue your Minor in your argument maketh nothing for you: becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of their increaſe of knowledge, and not of the originall begetting of knowledge, and ſo ſaith M. Caluin.*

I. D.

The text in the cleareſt tearmes that may bee diſtinguiſheth betweene Beleeuing and knowing, and vnto that giueth the priority before this: but your gloſſe confoundeth

foundeth their natures, and ſaith that the Apoſtle here ſpeaketh onely of increaſe of knowledge. Wo to the gloſſe that corrupteth the text: for if this bee S. *Iohns* meaning, it is as if hee ſhould ſay, *I write vnto you that know that yee are iuſtified & haue eternall life, that yee may increaſe in knowing that yee haue eternall life, and that yee may know yee are iuſtified and haue eternall life*, which how vnworthy it is the pen of an Apoſtle euery one eaſily ſeeth. But *Caluin* you ſay interpreteth the place as you doe. Bee it ſo: yet is it not the name of *Caluin* how venerable ſoeuer that may ſway this matter. For ſeeing I profeſſe to differ from him in the definition of Iuſtifying Faith, hee defining it by knowledge, I by Aſſiance: you may not thinke it vnreaſonable, if in this point, and the explication of ſuch ſcriptures as may ſeeme to concerne it, I deſire rather to bee preſſed with his reaſons, then borne downe with his authority. But what ſaith Caluin? *Becauſe there ought to bee dayly proceedings in Faith, therefore he writes to them that believe already, that they may more firmely, and certainly believe.* Whereunto I willingly aſſent, if you apply it as *Beza* in his annotations doth vnto the laſt clauſe of the verſe, and that yee may believe: for then the meaning without forcing or conſtraining the words will bee as if hee ſhould ſay, *I write vnto you that believe that believing yee may know yee haue eternall life, & knowing the ſame may conſtantly perſeuere and proceed on in Believing.* For as the clouds poure downe raine to moiſten the earth, and the earth moiſtned ſendeth vp vapours againe to make clouds: ſo likewiſe Faith begets Aſſurance, and Aſſurance being gotten doth againe confirme and ſtrengthen faith. And thus doe the Century-writers expound this place, gathering Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 4. p. 276.

from it that Cetainty of Saluation is an Effect of Faith, and ſo euidently diſtinguiſhing knowledge from Faith.

Treatiſe.

3. *Arg.* That which in nature comes after iuſtification cannot bee iuſtifying Faith. This appeares becauſe Faith is the Efficient Inſtrumentall cauſe of Iuſtification: and euery Efficient by the rule of Logicke is in nature before the Effect. But this knowledge or aſſurance is in nature after Iuſtification, *Ergo*, it is not Faith.

N. B.

Your Minor is very falſe, and ſo proued by my former arguments. For particular knowledge and aſſurance of our ſaluation is not in nature after Faith, but is Faith and wholy infuſed by the Spirit of God, and begotten by hearing of the Word preached, and commeth to act by degrees according to the meaſure of grace giuen of God. For it is in Habitu ſometime & not in actu, *as when one ſleepeth his beliefe is not in* actu, *and yet hee liueth vnto God by his faith which liueth powerfully in him though not actually.*

Faith habituall in power, actuall in the deed of beleeuing.

I. D.

The Maior of my Syllogiſme is vndeniable, becauſe as I haue ſaid Faith is the cauſe of iuſtification. For as D. *Fulke* ſaith vnto Briſtow excluding it from Efficient cauſes, Seeing Scripture often affirmeth that God worketh in vs by Faith, faith muſt needs be an inſtrumentall efficient when you haue ſaid all that you can, except you will teach.

Reioinder to Briſtow. p. 172.

teach vs new Grammar and Logicke. The Minor therefore you ſay is very falſe, and ſo proued by your former arguments. But thoſe arguments are already anſwered, and thus I proue the Minor. For as for the reſt of your idle and wilde talke touching the infuſion, begetting, degrees, habit, act of Faith, I willingly paſſe ouer, leſt purſuing you in this courſe I ſeeme to run riot and play the wanton with you.

Treatiſe.

The truth of a Propoſition is alwayes in nature before the knowledge of the truth: for Propoſitions are not therefore true, becauſe they are knowne ſo, but they are firſt true and knowne ſo. Therefore this Propoſition, I know I am iuſtified, ſpoken by one that is iuſtified, muſt needs preſuppoſe the partie before to be iuſtified.

N. B.

O. O. O. O. O.

L D.

What mum *Maſter Baxtar?* Hath *Sigalion* now inſtantly ſealed vp your lips that you cannot, or are you ſuddenly become a profeſſed *Pythagorean* that you may not ſpeake? For me thinkes you that haue beene ſo vocall and waſtfull of your breath in ſo many impertinent and friuolous excurſions, ſhould not now bee ſo ſparing and niggardly of a word or twaine vpon ſo neceſſary a point. But the truth is the argument is vnanſwerable

and inuincible, and therefore you held it better to ſay nothing, and ſlily to paſſe it ouer, then to marre all by ſaying nothing to the purpoſe. Which courſe if you had alſo vſed in the reſt of this diſputation, you ſhould haue ſaued this ſcribling labor, and I had receiued virgin paper from you. And ſo, as *Galba* in the iudgement of all might haue beene thought worthy of the empire if hee had not beene Emperor: you alſo in the opinion of ſome might haue beene counted able to write if you had not written. But now that after ſo much loudneſſe and clamourouſneſſe you are become ſo dumbe and ſilent, it argues that though ability faile, yet will ſhould not haue beene wanting, vnleſſe the euidence of truth had perforce made vp your mouth. And ſo conſtrueing your ſilence to bee in this point no leſſe then plaine yeelding, I paſſe on to the next argument.

Tacit. 1. Hiſt.

Treatiſe.

4. *Arg.* In conditionall Promiſes there can bee no Aſſurance of the thing promiſed before the performance of the condition. *v. g.* This is a conditionall Promiſe in the couenant of works, *Doe this and thou ſhalt liue*, Life is promiſed but on condition of Doing: and therefore vntill wee haue performed the condition, wee may not looke that God ſhould bee reciprocall and giue vs Life. Now in the Couenant of Grace, Iuſtification is promiſed, but vpon condition of Faith: ſo ſaith the Scripture, *Belieue and thy ſins ſhall be forgiuen thee.* Therefore the condition of Belieuing muſt firſt bee performed before wee can aſſure our ſelues our ſins are forgiuen. If ſo, then Faith going before, and Aſſurance follow-

following after, Aſſurance connot bee Iuſtifying Faith.

N. B.

I deny your Minor and ſay, there may bee an Aſſurance of Saluation in ſome meaſure, before there can bee the performance of Faith actuall in the higheſt meaſure: Therefore your Minor is vtterly falſe. For Faith in his true defined ſtate is a firme Aſſurance and Perſwaſion, and a firme Aſſurance and Perſwaſion is, Faith, and both the Greeke and Hebrew words ſignifieth Faith (before cited) doe declare. Yea this Aſſurance is giuen vnto vs together with the hearing of the Word of God Habitualiter, *and will ſhew it ſelfe* Actualiter *in due time, and therefore ſometime is* ἀπογεννία, *and ſometime is* πληροφορία, *the firſt in the beginning, the next in the Lords due time, and this can neuer be* ἀποστασία, *but* ſecundùm magis *or* minùs *ſhall* externas vel internas exerere vires, *ſhew forth his forces either within man or without.*

I. D.

To make all plaine, my argument reduced into the right forme ſtandeth thus, *That which goeth before iuſtification is not that which followes after iuſtification: But Faith goeth before iuſtification and Aſſurance followes after*, Ergo, *Faith is not Aſſurance.* The Minor of this Syllogiſme is that which you deny affirming it to be vtterly falſe, and you confirme it to bee ſo by this reaſon, *There may bee Aſſurance of Saluation in ſome meaſure before there can be Performance of Faith Actuall in the higheſt meaſure*, Ergo, *Faith goeth not before Aſſurance, nor doth Aſſurance follow after Faith.* The Antecedent of which

which Enthymeme I grant, for as much as there may bee Aſſurance in this life, but not the performance of Faith actuall in the higheſt meaſure, wee here *Believing only in part*, as the Apoſtle ſaith. But if hereupon it follow, *Therefore Faith goeth not before Aſſurance*, it will alſo follow, *Faith goeth not before Charity or good works*, becauſe Charity and good works may be in ſome meaſure, before Faith actuall bee in the higheſt meaſure: or thus, The elder Sonne is not borne before the yonger, becauſe the yonger may waxe as tall as a Pygmee before the elder bee growne to the ſtature of a Giant. Which Conſequences if they be abſurd and ridiculous, as abſurd and ridiculous is it to inferre that Faith cannot bee before Aſſurance, becauſe Aſſurance may bee in ſome meaſure before Faith bee in the higheſt meaſure. Nay farre better doth it follow from hence againſt your ſelfe that Faith is not Aſſurance, nor Aſſurance Faith. For if as you expreſly ſay Aſſurance may bee in a lower meaſure when Faith is in a higher, how can they poſſibly differing ſo in degrees but bee differing things? For although it be true that *more and leſſe doe not diuerſify the kind*, yet is it as true that the ſame indiuiduall quality cannot at the ſame time bee both intended and remitted, no more then the ſame ſtring in a Lute can at once bee ſtrained vp, and let downe, and yeeld at the ſame time both a baſe and treble ſound.

Inſt. Orat. l. 11.

In the reſidue of this Section, you ſhew your ſelfe to bee one of thoſe idle Oratours of whom *Quintilian* ſpeaketh, who neuer regard where the point or iſſue of the Queſtion lieth, ſo they may beſides the cauſe, either from the perſons or out of ſome common place find occaſion of declaiming. Such as was *Poſtumus* the Aduo-

Lib. 6. Epig. 19.

cate

cate in *Martiall*, who being entertained to plead the cauſe of one who had three Goats ſtolen from him by his neighbour left the proofe of this, and fell a diſcourſing of the battell of *Cannæ*, of the Mithridatike and Carthaginian wars, and other ſuch impertinent matters. But neuer was there any offended more notoriouſly in this kind then you, all thoſe ſpeeches are nothing els but extrauagances and by-matters. For I pray you, how doth it concerne my argument to talke of the origination of Faith in Greeke and Hebrew, how Aſſurance is giuen, how it ſhewes it ſelfe, of Oligopiſtie, Plerophorie, and Apoſtaſie, of the intention and remiſſion of it, and finally of the inward and outward forces thereof? Surely, as much as a Cypres-tree concernes a table of ſhipwrack as *Horace* ſpeaketh. And therefore giue mee leaue to plucke you by the eare, and to ſay vnto you as did the poore *Client* vnto his Lawyer aboue named, *Now I pray thee, Poſtume, ſay ſome thing at length touching my three Goats.* De arte Poët.

N. E.

Where it pleaſeth you to make remiſſion of ſinnes a Promiſe vpon a Condition, I tell you with all the Church of God in all ages it is rather an encouragement to beliue aſſuredly in Chriſt, as if hee ſhould ſay, Thy ſinnes bee forgiuen thee, therefore bee of good comfort, that both the former and latter, to wit forgiueneſſe of ſinnes and Beliefe might bee aſcribed to the mercie of God.

I. D.

The Minor which in the former ſection you denied,

namely that Faith goes before iuſtification and Aſſurance followes after, in my Treatiſe I thus proued, becauſe Iuſtification is promiſed vpon condition of Belieuing: and ſeeing in Conditionall promiſes there can bee no Aſſurãce of the thing promiſed before the performãce of the Condition, therfore in this promiſe we muſt Belieue before we can be iuſtified, and be iuſtified before we can be aſſured we are iuſtified. Now to this you ſay it is rather an encouragement, then a Promiſe vpon condition: as if it were impoſſible that Promiſe vpon condition might bee an encouragement. Whereas me thinkes a Generall doth greatly encourage his Souldiers when he promiſeth vnto them preferment and reward vpon condition of ſome peece of ſeruice well performed. And *Ioab* peraduenture would not haue beene ſo forward and venturous in the battell vnleſſe *Dauid* had promiſed the office of chiefe Captaine vpon condition of ſmiting the *Iebuſites*.

1. Cron. 11. 6.

But you haue reaſons for your ſaying more then a good many: for here like another *Tertullian* euery word almoſt you ſpeake is a Demonſtration. Firſt all the Church of God in all ages affirmeth with you: and yet as ſhall plentifully appeare in the next Section, the Church of God neuer vnderſtood but that Remiſſion of ſinnes was promiſed vpon condition of Faith. But as *Anaxagoras* when hee was driuen to his ſhifts and could not finde out the reaſon of ſome things, was wont to ſay it was the doing of *Nous*: euen ſo when you haue boldly affirmed that which you can by no meanes proue, it is your manner deſperately to auouch that it is the ſaying of the Church. Secondly, you ſay this ſpeech, *Belieue and thy ſinnes ſhall bee forgiuen thee* is all one with this.

Thy

Thy ſinnes bee forgiuen thee, therefore bee of good comfort. Which happily wee may thinke not to be altogether ſo witleſſe, if alſo you can perſwade vs that a Phyſician ſaying vnto his Patient, *Vſe carefully the courſe of Phiſicke I ſhall preſcribe vnto you, and you ſhall ſurely recouer of your ſickneſſe*, meaneth thereby no other then as if hee ſhould ſay, *Bee of good cheere, for thou art already recouered of thy ſickneſſe.* Laſtly, by this meanes, you ſay both the former and the latter, to wit Forgiueneſſe of ſinnes and Beliefe may bee aſcribed to the mercy of God. As if Promiſe of Remiſſion of ſinnes vpon condition of Faith were any way derogatory vnto the Mercy of God, but that both the one and the other may this notwithſtanding bee aſcribed thereunto. For if when God out of his ſoueraigne authority commaundeth to Belieue, it bee neuertheleſſe of his grace that wee can and doe Belieue, according to that of S. Auguſtin, *Giue what thou commandeſt, and command what thou wilt*: why when out of his mercy hee promiſeth Forgiueneſſe if we doe Belieue, ſhould it not bee aſcribed vnto the ſame his mercy that we doe performe the condition and Belieue? But who knowes the ſalt that is in you? You are the onely Pericles of this age, *Suada* ſits vpon your lips, and you alone leaue a ſting behind you. For had it not been for this threefold cord of yours, I could neuer ſo eaſily haue been drawne from this truth. Eupolis.

N. B.

Farthermore where you bring for the confirmation of your Minor (to proue Iuſtification to bee conditionall with the Papiſts) this place of Math. cap. 9. v. 2. Beati M. Downes falſhood, in citing, conſtruing and adding, to the Scripture.

πάντα ἀφιεται σοι ἁμαρτίαι σου, Confide fili, remissa sunt tibi peccata tua, *Bee of good comfort Sonne thy sinnes bee forgiuen thee: you wrest it first to tell vs that Christ said to him, Thy sinnes be forgiuen thee if thou wilt bee of good comfort, which is false, and no part of Christs meaning, but rather the contrary, bidding the man sicke of the Palsie be of good comfort, because his sinnes (being the cause of his disease) were forgiuen him. This could* Saint Hierome *haue told you, yea* Chrysostome *and* Master Caluin, Erasmus, *and the Greeke Scholiast. But what may wee expect will bee the sequell of this, if you bee not hindred in your course? Well you haue a mind to doe mischiefe, but you want power as spake* Plutarch *to one, and so I Hope shall.*

Tom. 9. in Mat.
In Mat. c. 9.
Harm. in Mat. 9.
Archidamus Zeuxidis filius in Plut.

The second point which I challenge you in is false translating of the Greeke text, contrary to the words themselues, and all the world for 1600. yeares. You translate Mat. 9. v. 2. Crede fili & remittentur tibi peccata tua, *Sonne beliue, and then thy sinnes shall bee forgiuen thee, when you should haue said with* Saint Hierome, Ambrose, Beda, Caluin, Beza, Erasm. *and the Church of England, Sonne bee of good comfort, thy sinnes bee already forgiuen thee. The Greeke word can by no meanes signifie to Beliue, but rather to bee confident or Bold, to trust to, and not to Beliue in, as* Opibus confidere, Cicero, *to trust to his riches, not to beliue in his riches, to assure my selfe that they shall benefit mee, not to beliue in them as my God to saue mee. Beside the Greeke word to Beliue, is farre off another name and nature. Againe by what authority doe you translate, Thy sinnes shall bee forgiuen thee, when you should say, thy sinnes are forgiuen thee? Haue you any commission* in contemptum omnium Grammaticorum, *to change tenses also, as you take vpon you vnder pretence*

Mr Downe falsly translating the Greeke text.

of

of κενὰ κενῶς to coine Distinctions? But I may easily spie your drift: you would needs parget your rotten cause and miserable Minor with this vntempered morter. Well, all the Schollers in our countrey will thinke the worse of κενὰ κενῶς as long as they liue for this tricke. But what intolerable impudency is this and beyond all the rest to adde the word or coniunction καὶ, & and, to the Scripture, saying (by your commission κενὰ κενῶς) Beliue Sonne and then thy sinnes shall be forgiuen thee. Quite contrary is this to your knowledge, and conscience. Bethinke you therefore what a fearefull iudgement you incurre, and craue mercy at the hand of God while you haue time, confesse your errour and cancell your commission, so shall you haue the Church your Mother, and her Children your Brethren and friends.

M. Downe addeth to the Scripture.

Apoc. 22.

I. D.

That which in the former section you spake but lispingly, here you deliuer more plainely and articularly: for there you say it is rather an encouragement, but now you affirme peremptorily they are none but Papists that hold Iustification to bee conditionall, to such extremities & straits am I driuen that I am faine to borrow aide and assistance of the common aduersary. But if I bee mistaken herein I hope I shall the more easily find pardon, because they of whom I learned it seemed vnto me to bee no Papists, and were commonly taken for very good Protestants. *Christ*, saith Beza, *is offered vnto vs to be possessed of vs with this condition if we doe beliue in him, On that condition*, saith Vrsinus, *is Christs righteousnesse made ours, if wee receiue it: Now that receiuing is the worke and act of Faith alone. The condition of Faith*,

Conf. c. 4. 9. 4.

In Catechismo q de Euang.

Syntag. de Euâng. Art. 30. Cent. 1. l. 1. c. 4. p. 93.

faith Hemingius, *is required that the benefit may be applied, that is remission of sinnes. The law*, say the Century-writers, *hath the Promise with condition of Doing and fulfilling it: the Gospell hath the free Promise with condition of Believing and receiving it by Faith.* That saith Master Foxe, *which properly wee inquire is for what cause or reason Saluation and Pardon of sinnes is promised, whether vpon some condition or none at all: And that the Promise is made vpon no condition no man I thinke will say, wherefore it remaines of necessity wee acknowledge some condition, and that is Faith. In the Law*, saith Whitaker, *the condition was hard which no man could satisfy, but Christ propounds vnto vs a more easy condition, Believe and thou shalt bee saued. Gods promises*, saith Fulke, *require the condition of Faith in them that shall obtaine them.* Finally Cardinall *Bellarmine* who hitherto hath euer been esteemed no meane Papist reports this to bee the confession of all his aduersaries, and that they cannot deny it, *That remission of sinnes is promised vpon condition of Faith.* But Lord what ods and difference there is betweene simple folke and intelligent persons! For vnlesse you had told it mee I had neuer knowne that *Bellarmins* aduersaries were Papists, nor that these men whom I haue named had beene wolues in sheepskins. Neither did I vntill now vnderstand what you meant when you charged mee with Popery, and speaking pure Papist: your meaning I see was, that I spake right as *Beza*, *Vrsinus*, *Hemingius*, the *Century-Writers*, *Foxe*, *Whitaker*, *Fulke*, and all the rest of that ranke vse to do.

De Christo gratis iustif. p. 237. 244.

In Camp. 8. Rat.

Against Sanders cauils on the Lords supper. p. 424. De iustif. l. 1. c. 12.

Ter. Eun. Act. 2. Sc. 11.

For confirmation of my Minor, and to proue Iustification to bee conditionall, I bring, as you say, that place of Math. *Be of good comfort Sonne thy sinnes bee forgiuen thee.*

thee. In handling whereof you tell mee farther, firſt that *I wreſt the text and falſifie the meaning thereof*, then that *I tranſlate the Greeke falſly and contrary to the words themſelues and all the world for* 1600 *yeeres*, laſtly that *moſt impudently and quite contrary to knowledge and conſcience, I adde vnto the Scripture.* Telling mee moreouer that *I haue a mind to doe miſchiefe, but want power, that I contemne all Grammar, and parget a rotten cauſe with vntempered morter, and therefore muſt needs incurre fearefull iudgement, if in time I craue not mercy at the hand of God.* Thus, *Maſter Baxter*, like *Saint George* a horſe-backe you fight with a painted dragon, and faining monſters to your ſelfe ſet vpon them with ſuch Herculean impetuouſneſſe and fury, as if you would amaze ſimple people with your great puiſſance & powres: and then as if you had ſtaild to powder your true aduerſary as well as your imaginary and ſtrawen enemy, you giue foorth moſt terrible menaces and threats, that folke henceforward may not dare to meddle with your mothers ſonne more. For where I pray you doe you finde this paſſage of *S. Mathew* quoted by me? and vnleſſe you had reſolued by falſhood and forgerie to maintaine this quarrell againſt mee, with what face could you father the allegation of it vpon mee? No Sir, I did not ſo much as dreame of that place: only I ſay in generall that the Scriptures make this to bee the tenor of the Euangelicall promiſe *Belieue and thy ſinnes ſhall be forgiuen thee*, Ioh. 3. 10. little thinking that you who would bee counted a Maſter in Iſrael had beene ignorant of a doctrine ſo euident and fundamentall. For that ſo it is let theſe few texts bee carefully conſidered, *Belieue in the Lord Ieſus and thou ſhalt bee ſaued and thine houſhold*; *That through his Name* Act. 16. 31. Act. 10. 43.

all

all that beleiue in him shall receiue remission of sinnes: That whosoeuer beleueth in him should not perish but haue eternall life: If thou beleiue thou shalt bee saued: That the promise of Iesus Christ should bee giuen to them that beleiue. To these few I might easily adde six hundred mo, all which although not in precise forme of words, yet in vertue and meaning are all one with this *Beleiue and thy sinnes shall be forgiuen thee*: and from them doe all Diuines gather that the Promise of the Gospell is not absolute but conditionall, if we Beleiue as is aboue plentifully declared. Which being so, you shew your selfe in this Thrasonicall and swaggering section to bee too-too base and recreant, vtterly void both of forhead and conscience: otherwise you would not first so palpably and desperately haue belied mee, and then so impudently and vnciuilly reuell vpon mee. Though you deserue it, yet will I not cast backe the dirt you here throw at mee againe into your owne face, I shall but defile my hands in so doing: rather will I as Saint *Bernard* counselleth; *Breake the arrowes of contumely vpon the sheeld of Patience, and hold forth the buckler of a good conscience against the sword of your malicious tongue.*

Ioh. 3. 15. 16. Rom. 10. 9. Gal. 3. 22.

Ser. 40. de modo benè viuendi.

But albeit I intended not, nor aimed at this place of *Mathew*, as being euery way vnsufficient to proue that iustification is promised vpon condition of Faith: yet is it not so abhorring from my purpose, but that it may affoard at least a probable proofe for my maine conclusion. For *Beza* in his annotations on *Mark.* 2. 5. doth vs to wit that the word ἀφίωνται may be translated imperatiuely, thus, Be thy sinnes pardoned; as if it were in the third person plurall of the Coniunctiue mood (which *Diomedes* called the Mandatiue mood) for ἀφῶνται, as ἀφῇ, saith

ſaith *Euſtathius*, and ἀρὶν. is vſed by *Homer* for ἀρύ. and ἀρύω. The reaſon why it may thus be turned is, becauſe the Scribes vnderſtood Chriſt, as if hee himſelfe had actually forgiuen the Palſie-man his ſins, as appeareth in the ſixt and ſeuenth verſes, which they could not ſo haue conceiued if hee had onely told him that his ſinnes were forgiuen him. Now if this bee the right tranſlation, what ſay you to this argument? *The Palſie-man firſt believed* (for ſo it is ſaid) *When Iesus ſaw their Faith*, meaning as well the Faith of the ſicke man as of them that brought him) *and then after Chriſt forgaue his ſins*, Ergo, *Faith goes before Remiſſion: But Aſſurance, as wee haue ſhewed, followes after Remiſſion*, Ergo, *it is not Faith.* But you will follow the ordinary tranſlation. I giue you good leaue, for I take it to bee the trueſt: yet from thence alſo thus I argue, *The Palſie man believed, yet was not aſſured his ſinnes were forgiuen him till Chriſt told him ſo much*, for otherwiſe what needed Chriſt to tell him what hee knew already, *Ergo, Aſſurance is not Faith.*

Treatiſe.

That from whence followes a blaſphemous abſurditie cannot bee a truth, for from truth nought but truth can bee concluded: But from this, that Faith is Aſſurance ſuch an abſurditie doth follow. What is that? That God commands to Belieue an vntruth, and to bee aſſured of that which neuer ſhall bee. For God being truth cannot command falſhood to bee taken for truth. Neither tell mee here of who art thou that diſputeſt with God? For this is a ruled caſe in Diuinity, God cannot doe things which imply contradiction, and therefore not

make vntruth to bee truth, or knowledge errour. Now that this abſurdity followes from thence thus I demonſtrate. God commands the Reprobate to belieue: for, for vnbeliefe the world ſhall bee condemned. But no condemnation but for breach of a commandement, for ἀμαρτία ἀνομία, and therefore they are commanded to Belieue. I aske you then what it is to belieue? You will ſay, to know to bee aſſured. Therefore God commands the Reprobates to know and to bee aſſured. But this is a blaſphemous abſurdity, therefore is your opinion abſurd which infers it.

N. B.

Two things in this argument are betweene vs to be diſcuſſed: Firſt, whether it bee a blaſphemous abſurdity, to hold that God commandeth a reprobate, to belieue that hee ſhall bee ſaued. You affirme it, I deny it. Secondly, whether in this point God commandeth a Reprobate to belieue an vntruth, when hee commandeth a reprobate to belieue and hee ſhall be ſaued. You affirme it, I deny it.

I. D.

That it is a blaſphemous abſurdity to ſay that *God commands Reprobates to know and to bee aßured, that they are already iuſtified and ſhall bee ſaued*, I haue indeed affirmed, and I thinke haue alſo ſufficiently confirmed. But that *God ſhould commaund a Reprobate to belieue an vntruth if hee command him to belieue and hee ſhall bee ſaued*, I neuer yet affirmed. What then? This that, *He ſhould command him to belieue an vntruth, if hee command him, to belieue that hee is iuſtified and ſhall bee ſaued.* A ſmall diffe-

difference will you ſay betweene And, and That. So was there betwixt *Shibboleth* and *Sibboleth*, yet enough to diſcerne an enemy from a friend. For this propoſition, *Belieue and thou ſhalt bee ſaued* is Hypotheticall and Conditionall, as if it were ſaid in other tearmes, *If thou belieue thou ſhalt bee ſaued*: But this, *Belieue and aſſure thy ſelfe that thou ſhalt bee ſaued* is Categoricall and Abſolute excluding all Condition. Now that God, commands all both Elect and Reprobate to Belieue in the Lord Ieſus, and promiſes vnto them Iuſtification and Saluation conditionally if they Belieue, I grant: but that hee commands the Reprobate abſolutely to know and aſſure himſelfe, that hee is already iuſtified, and ſhall hereafter bee ſaued and glorified, I conſtantly deny. Which yet your opinion that Faith is an Aſſurance neceſſarily infers, and therefore cannot bee true. This matter being thus cleared, let vs now bring your anſwers to the ballance and weigh them. Iude. 12. 6.

N. B.

Firſt, therefore I anſwer, God cammandeth all men to Belieue the Goſpell to bee ſaued, and therefore the Reprobates. If you demaund why hee commandeth them to belieue that which neuer ſhall be, I anſwer, So it pleaſed him: So anſwereth Ieſus Chriſt the Sonne of God, (Math. 11. v. 26. Now goe, Maſter Downe *and diſpute with Ieſus Chriſt, and tell him, that his Father deliuereth a blſphemous abſurdity. Search not too farre into the counſels of God, leſt you bee ouerwhelmed of his Maieſty: reuerence his doctrine, if you cannot vnderſtand it, for who is able to* Mat. 16. 15. 16.

ſearch out the reaſon of his wayes and counſels, Rom. 11. *ſeeing they bee like a great deep?*

I. D.

No, *Maſter Baxter*, it is not for duſt and aſhes to contend with the Creator of all things: nor for baſe clay to enter diſputation with ſo glorious a Maieſtie. Whatſoeuer that eternall truth ſpeaketh, I reuerence and adore, and dare not preſume to ſearch a higher reaſon of his actions then his will, knowing full well that his will is the prime rule and cauſe of Iuſtice, and therefore that it is both folly to ſeeke a former then the firſt, and impiety to ſubiect Gods will vnto ſome extrinſecall director. But yet with you who (as I take it) are made of no better moulds then my ſelfe, and are not exempted from thoſe humane infirmities, whereunto the reſt of your brethren are ſubiect, I hope I may bee bold to enter argument and to hold diſputation, as in other matters, ſo touching this preſent queſtion alſo. To you therefore this I ſay that, *God doth indeed command the reprobate to beliene vnto ſaluation*, and yet neuer ſhall he beliene nor bee ſaued. The cauſe hereof I know to bee Gods will, and am content with all lowlineſſe and humility to ſay with Chriſt, *Euen ſo O Father becauſe thy good pleaſure was ſuch.* But what is this to our purpoſe? For it is one thing to *command a Reprobate to beliene the Goſpell*, another thing to *command him to know and aſſure himſelfe that hee is already iuſtified and ſhall bee ſaued:* for to Beliene the Goſpell is to aſſent vnto an infallible truth, but to bee perſwaded of the other is to yeeld to that which neither is nor euer ſhall bee true. You ſhould therefore

Mat. 11. 26.

euident-

euidently demonſtrate out of the Scriptures that God commands a Reprobate ſo to bee aſſured and perſwaded: and then if I reſted not ſatisfied with Gods reuealed will, you might iuſtly bid mee *goe and diſpute with Chriſt*, and forbid to *ſearch into the counſels of God leſt I be ouerwhelmed with his Maieſty*. But if in Gods booke you cannot ſhew it, I hold it a humane fancy rather then a diuine truth: and therefore though I may not curiouſly prie into the ſecrets of God, yet may I freely trie and examine the ground of mens opinions.

N. B.

Againe it is an vntruth that God commandeth, when he biddeth a Reprobate to beleiue and hee ſhall bee ſaued. For, if hee could beleiue, he ſhould then be ſaued without doubt, Ioh. 11. *That hee cannot beleiue, the reaſon is, Chriſt hath not waſhed him* Io. 13. 8. *neither hath opened his heart to beleiue. So that if hee could haue beleiued, hee ſhould haue this doctrine effectuall vnto him to ſaluation. That he therefore could not beleiue is not to bee imputed to the falſity of the doctrine, but to the hardneſſe of his owne heart.*

I. D.

The commandement of God is abſolute, Beleiue: the promiſe of Saluation is conditionall, if we Beleiue. That the Promiſe is conditionall you denyed in your anſwer to the former argument: now alſo you deny that Beleiuing is commanded. Whereby you bewray, *how inexpert you are in the Word of righteouſneſſe*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh: and that whereas by office you are, and Heb. 5. 12 13.

concerning the time ought to be a teacher, yet haue you need your ſelfe to be taught the very elements of the Chriſtian Religion. That therefore the Promiſe is conditionall I haue in the due place demonſtrated: now that Beleiuing is commanded remaineth to bee proued, or rather it is already proued, thus, *No condemnation but for breach of a Commandement, Condemnation for vnbeliefe: for, for vnbeliefe the world ſhall bee condemned*, Ergo, *Beliefe commanded.* But this reaſon according to your wont you cunningly ſuppreſſe, and hauing found out a new Art of diſputation, thinke it enough to ſcorne the premiſſes, and with a bold face to deny the Concluſion. Yet for your further confuſion vnto neceſſary conſequence, I adde the expreſſe words of Scripture, *This*, ſaith Iohn, 1 Ioh. 3. 23. *is his commandement that wee beleiue in the Name of his Sonne Ieſus Chriſt.* And vnto diuine authority I adde the humble conſent of holy men of God. *Beza* expoundeth that place of Saint *Iohns* Goſpell, *This is the worke* Ioh. 6. 29. *of God that yee beleiue in me*, on this wiſe, *This is that which God requireth of you that yee beleiue in me. The Lord commandeth*, ſaith Hemingius, *that we beleiue. Together with the Promiſe*, ſaith Maſter Perkins, *is conioined the Exhortation or Commandement to Beleiue, which is more generall then the Promiſe, becauſe the promiſe belongs only to Beleiuers, but the Cõmandement both to Beleiuers & vnbeleiuers.* Finally, the whole Church of Saxony thus confeſſeth, *It is the eternall & immutable commandment of God, that we ſhould beleiue in the Son of God, according to this ſaying* (which is my very ground) *the Spirit ſhall conuince the world of ſinne, becauſe they beleiue not in mee.* Nay, ſee the lucke of it, that which here you affirme to be an vntruth, not many lines before you haue

De gra. vniuer. De Prædeſt. & gratia.

Harm. Conf. Sax. of remiſſion of ſins & iuſtif.

auowed

auowed to bee a truth ſaying, *God commandeth all to Beliue, and therefore the Reprobates.* Yea doe you not in this place vnſay that which you ſay, ſaying, *it is vntrue that God commandeth when hee biddeth a Reprobate to Beliue?* For hee that Biddeth in my vnderſtanding commandeth: vnleſſe you that complaine of nice and ſubtle Diſtinctions in others, haue learned of late by ſome new-found nicetie to diſtinguiſh there where the letters and ſyllables onely differing, there is otherwiſe an identie of nature and definition. A man would wonder how you could ſo ſoone forget your ſelfe, but that it is commonly ſeene a liar hath ſeldome or neuer a good memory.

But to proue that God commands not a Reprobate to belieue you come vpon mee with a moſt mighty and inſoluble Enthymem. What is that I beſeech you? Marie this. *A Reprobate if he could belieue, he ſhould then without doubt bee ſaued:* Ergo, *God doth not command him to Belieue.* A deſperate Demonſtration I promiſe you: for by the ſame reaſon you may conclude, that God commands him not to obey the Precepts of the Morall law neither, Becauſe if hee could keepe them he ſhould bee ſaued. What you conceiue may bee the knot and fowlder as it were of this Conſequence I cannot well imagine, vnleſſe it be one of two, either this, God promiſeth the Reprobate hee ſhall bee ſaued if hee Belieue, *Ergo*, hee commandeth him not to Belieue: or this, The Reprobate cannot belieue, *Ergo*, God commandeth him not to Belieue, for your words ſeeme to bee indifferent either way. If you intend the former, firſt, you contradict your owne ſelfe, for in your anſwer to the former argument you deny Iuſtification and Saluation.

tion to bee promiſed vpon condition of Faith. Secondly, euery *Catechumenus* and Nouice in Diuinity knowes that God vnto Commandement vſually annexeth Promiſe to draw on Obedience: as in the Couenant of works, firſt hee Commandeth, Doe this and then Promiſeth, if thou doe it thou ſhalt liue; and in the Couenant of Grace alſo, firſt hee Commandeth, Belieue, and then addeth the Promiſe, if thou belieue thou ſhalt bee ſaued. So that Promiſe and Commandement exclude not one the other, neither doth it follow, Faith is the condition of a Promiſe, *Ergo*, it is not commanded. If you vnderſtand the latter, then know that as *Auguſtin*, and *Barnard*, and all Diuines not infected with Pelagianiſme ſay, God commandeth ſome things which man cannot doe, to the end that knowing his owne inſufficiency, hee may craue of him the helpe of grace that hee may doe them. And if God doe command any ſupernaturall action vnto the Reprobate as without doubt hee doth, then doth hee alſo command ſome thing aboue his power: for being meerely naturall he cannot produce any ſupernaturall operation. Whereupon it followeth euidently that although a Reprobate cannot belieue, yet neuertheleſſe hee may bee commanded to Belieue.

Well, yet you will proue that a Reprobate cannot Belieue. To what end? for it is not denied, and you ſhould rather ſtrengthen your Conſequence, and proue that therefore Faith is not commanded. Notwithſtanding let vs heare your reaſon, for it ſeemeth to bee very remarkable. *That hee cannot Belieue*, ſay you, *the reaſon is, Chriſt hath not waſhed him.* If you had ſaid as followeth, Chriſt hath not opened his heart to Belieue, or, it is to

be

bee imputed to the hardnes of his owne heart, and had ſtopt there, I ſhould eaſily haue yeelded vnto you: but now that you ſay the *reaſon is becauſe Chriſt hath not waſhed him*, I muſt needs tell you it is vnreaſonable reaſon, for it implies that wee are firſt waſhed and then Belieue, whereas both Scripture and the analogie of Faith teach vs that we firſt belieue and then afterward are waſhed. Search the booke of God, and there ſhall you read, that wee are iuſtified by Faith, that the heart is purified by Faith, that God hath ſet forth Ieſus Chriſt to bee a reconciliation through Faith in his Blood. Which Blood although it haue in it ſufficient vertue and force to cleanſe vs from the leproſie of all our ſinnes, yet doth it not actually waſh or purge any vnleſſe it bee particularly applied and accepted by Faith. Otherwiſe, as *Ambroſe* excellently ſpeaketh, *if thou belieue not, Chriſt deſcended not for thee, Chriſt ſuffered not for thee.* Wherby it manifeſtly appeareth that Remiſſion of ſinnes is an effect or conſequence of Faith, and that therefore the reaſon of the Reprobates vnbeliefe, is not becauſe Chriſt hath not waſht him, but rather the reaſon why Chriſt hath not waſhed him is, becauſe hee doth not belieue, nor hath by Faith applyed the blood of Chriſt to himſelfe for the remiſſion of his ſinnes. Where you adde negatiuely, that the Reprobates vnbeliefe, is not to bee imputed to the falſity of the Doctrine, whether you meane thereby either this Doctrine that *God commands him to belieue*, or this that *it is abſurd hee ſhould command him to bee aſſured*, I confeſſe indeed, that neither is the cauſe why the Reprobate cannot belieue: but that either of them is falſe, you ſhall neuer bee able to ſhew, and I haue ſufficiently proued the contrary.

Rom. 3. 28. Act. 15. 9. Rom. 3. 25.

De fide ad Gratian.

N. B.

Ex. 14. 4. Rom. 9. *If you aske, who hath hardned him? I answer, God; who hath power ouer the vessels of his owne making, to shew his Iustice or mercy vpon them as pleaseth his diuine Maiesty.* Ioh. 12. 39. 40. *If you will demand the cause, why God would not giue him a fleshly heart to beleiue? I answer I know not:* Est enim aliqua docta ignorantia, *there is a certaine learned ignorance, as well teacheth* Master Caluin; *neither can our shallow wits search out the cause of his doings. But this I know that it is so, and the cause thereof principally to be his good pleasure. To conclude therefore this point, this Doctrine bringeth no blasphemous absurdity, as you impurely and impiously affirme, neither is the Doctrine false or implieth contradictories, though our blind natures cannot vnderstand the things that bee of God. Of this matter and argument, let these places bee well weighed, and by you either answered or reuerenced.* Rom. 11. 23. Gal. 3. 22. Act. 13. 48. 2 Thess. 3. 2. Mat. 13. 11. Prou. 16. 4. Rom. 9. 18, 19, 20. *and from henceforth leaue off to greeue the Spirit of God, wherewith the elect are sealed vnto the day of Redemption.*

I. D.

Lib. 2. c. 5. See Muret. var. lect. l. 7. c. 10. This is right that Sophysticall place which *Aristotle* in his Topicks calleth *Apagogen*, that is *Abduction*. For whereas I goe about to proue, that God commandeth not a Reprobate to bee assured, because so doing hee should command him to beleiue a manifest falshood, which implieth contradiction, and affirmeth errour to bee truth: you not knowing what answer to make vnto the

the argument, deriue the attention of the Reader another way, and runne out into the common place of Gods ſecret counſels, and the cauſe of Induration, and the Reprobates inability to belieue, diſcourſing too and fro of theſe things at pleaſure, hauing no other reaſon for ſo doing but onely, becauſe in my argument you read the word Reprobate, and that I told you, in this point you had no iuſt cauſe to ſay vnto mee (as in our priuate conference you did) *who art thou that diſputeth with God?* And yet as if all the while you had been in the very bowels of the cauſe, and had not wandred ſo much as a haires breadth from it, you conclude very ſoberly and ſadly, *Therefore this Doctrine bringeth no abſurdity, neither is falſe, nor implyeth contradiction.* But faine would I know what the Premiſſes are whereupon you inferre this Therefore: or whether by the rules of your Logicke you may conclude without them: Vnleſſe this bee the ſequele I know not what to make of it, *Our ſhallow wits cannot ſearch out the cauſe of Gods works*, Ergo, *wee may not thinke it abſurd that God ſhould command a Reprobate to belieue and aſſure himſelfe of that which neither is nor neuer ſhall be true.* Vaine man, proue once that God commandeth ſo, and I will preſently grant, it is not abſurd to thinke ſo. Why diſpute you ſo earneſtly of the reaſon why it is, when I flatly deny the thing that it is? And why doe you thus alwayes grate vpon the Concluſions, and make ſo little reckoning to anſwer the proofes I bring for it?

Well, not to wreſtle with words any longer, nor ſo fruitleſly to beate the aire, becauſe you thinke like the Cuttle-Fiſh to eſcape the net, by caſting about you a filthy inke of foule ſpeeches, telling me I ſpeak impurely & impiouſly,

impiously, and charging me with Presumption and Curiosity, for inquiring into the Counsels of God: giue mee leaue by distinguishing matters to cleare the water which you wittingly and purposely haue pudled, and withall to let the Reader see how basely and cowardly you seeke our starting holes to shift your selfe aside from my arguments, rather then Schollerly to answer them by some conuenient solutions. Consider therefore I pray you these few Positions.

1. The secret Counsels of God are those matters which hee hath treasured vp in the closet of his owne knowledge, and doth not disclose vnto mankind: but what truth soeuer it hath pleased him in wisdome to reueale vnto vs, and hath registred in his Word, is not to bee esteemed nor taken for a secret.

2. As to search into the hidden and secret Counsels of God is damnable Presumption, so not to search and inquire into his reuealed will is damnable Negligence. For as *Moyses* saith, *The secret things belong vnto the Lord our God, but the things reuealed vnto vs and our children for euer.* Whereupon Prosper, *The things which God would haue hidden must not be searched, and the things which hee hath made manifest must not bee neglected, least in them we be found vnlawfully curious, and in these damnably vngratefull.*

Deut. 29. 29.

De vocat. Gent. l. 1. c. 7.

3. They therefore that painfully and diligently trauell to find out such truths as are either expressed or infolded in the written word, are not to bee tearmed Curious but Studious. So distinguisheth Saint Augustin, *Although both,* saith hee, *bee carried with a great desire of knowing, yet the curious man inquireth those things which nothing concerne him, and the Studious man contrarily inqui-*

De vtil. credendi ca. 9.

inquireth thoſe things which doe pertaine vnto him.

4. This is a reuealed truth that, There is no contradiction in God, and that Hee cannot doe thoſe things which imply contradiction, or are repugnant vnto the nature and definition of a thing. For in God, as ſaith S. *Paul*, there is not yea and nay, but yea and Amen; neither is it poſſible that hee ſhould lie, or deny himſelfe, and it is rather impotency then Power ſo to bee able to doe, whereas contrarily, as elegantly Saint *Auguſtin* ſaith *Powerfully hath hee not power to doe this, neither is it infirmity but firmity, becauſe that truth cannot bee falſe.* 2 Cor. 1. 17. 18. 19. 20. Heb. 6. 18. De Trin. l. 15. c. 14.

5. Theſe two Propoſitions are contradictory, The Reprobate is iuſtified, The Reprobate is not iuſtified: and, The Reprobate ſhall bee ſaued, The Reprobate ſhall not bee ſaued. God therefore cannot make that they ſhould be true at once. For as Saint *Auguſtin* ſaith, *Whoſoeuer ſaith, if God bee omnipotent, let him make that thoſe things which haue been haue not been, ſees not that he ſaith, if God be omnipotent, let him make that thoſe things which are true in that they are true be falſe.* Contrà Faustum Man. l. 26. c. 5.

6. One part of the Contradiction is neceſſarily falſe namely this, The Reprobate is iuſtified, The Reprobate ſhall bee ſaued: for they onely who are Predeſtinated vnto life, are as Saint *Paul* ſaith, effectually called, and they onely who are effectually called are iuſtified and ſhall bee glorified. And if it were poſſible that they ſhould bee ſaued, then were there change in the vnchangeable decree of God which hath finally reiected them, which is impoſſible. Rom. 8. 30.

7. Hee that commands a Reprobate that is not iuſtified and ſhall neuer bee ſaued, to beleiue that hee is iuſtified and ſhall be ſaued, implieth a Contradiction there-

in, and makes Falshood to bee Truth, and Faith errour. For according to that infallible maxime, *Falshood is not vnder Faith:* and therefore if the Obiect bee Falshood it is not Faith which apprehendeth it for true, if it bee Faith Falshood is not the Obiect thereof. So that hee which commands that false Proposition to bee believed, makes that to bee Faith which cannot beare the definition of Faith, and that to bee the Obiect which is not the Obiect thereof, that is as I said makes Faith to bee error, and Falshood Truth, which are contradictories.

8. God therefore neither doth nor can so command: neither is it impure or impious to affirme so much, being in the Word of God so manifestly reuealed. Impious rather and blasphemous is it to say the contrary; for it imputes impotency and weaknes vnto God, making him to say, Yea and Nay, and to auouch that for truth which is euidently false.

9. But this opinion, that Faith is an Assurance, infers this blasphemous absurdity. For as I haue shewed, God cõmands all men, euen Reprobates to believe now to believe as you say is to bee assured of iustification and Saluation, *Ergo*, God commands the Reprobate to be assured of his Iustification and Saluation, which is absurd.

10. Absurd therefore is that opinion that Faith is Assurance which infers it. For from truth no absurdity or blasphemie but onely truth can follow. These few Positions I pray thee, Gentle Reader, consider diligently, and compare *Master Baxters* reply with them, and then bee iudge whether hee paint not gourds as it is in the Prouerbe, and talke cleane beside the purpose.

Those places of Scripture which you desire may bee well waighed, and then by mee either answered or reue-

renced

renced, I haue according to your deſire duly examined, and doe from my heart adore them as being the words of the Eternall Verity: and this anſwer doe I giue vnto them, that not one of them touches the queſtion in debate betwixt vs. The firſt telleth vs that *the Iewes if they perſiſt not in infidelity, ſhall againe by the power of God bee ingrafted*; the ſecond that *the Scripture hath concluded all vnder ſinne, that the promiſe by the Faith of Ieſus Chriſt might bee giuen to them that Belieue*; both which argue againſt your ſelfe that Faith is the condition of the Promiſe; the third ſaith that *as many as were ordained vnto eternall life belieued*; the fourth that *euery man hath not Faith*; the fift that *to know the myſteries of the kingdome of Heauen is giuen to ſome and denied to other ſome*, by which three it is cleere, that Reprobates doe not belieue, but the Elect onely: the ſixt affirmeth that *God made the wicked for the euill day*; the laſt that *God ſheweth mercy vpon whome hee will, and hardneth alſo whome he will*, and that in this point there is no diſputing with God, intimating therein that there is both an Election and Reprobation, and that both depend vpon the good pleaſure of God. But not one of them proueth that God commandeth *a Reprobate to aſſure himſelfe of his preſent iuſtification and future Saluation* which is the matter in queſtion: and therefore I hope I may notwithſtanding them all freely conclude that as God cannot command to doe that which is vniuſt, becauſe hee is iuſtice it ſelfe, ſo he cannot command to belieue that which is vntrue becauſe hee is truth it ſelfe. Neither doe I (I truſt) ſo concluding, grieue the Spirit of God, although perhaps therein I greeue your ſtubborne ſpirit, which hath (I feare me) throughout this reply too much rebelled againſt the light

Rom. 11. 23
Gal. 3. 22.
Act. 13. 48.
2. Theſſ. 3. 2.
Mat. 13. 11.
Prou. 16. 4
Rom. 9. 18. 19. 20.

light: and therefore take heed leſt you your ſelfe *greeue the Spirit of God, wherewith the elect are ſealed vnto the day of Redemption.* Eph. 4. 30.

Treatiſe.

Arg. 6. That which the wicked may haue, cannot bee iuſtifying Faith, for it is The Faith of the Elect: But the wicked may haue this Perſwaſion, yea and many haue beene moſt confidently perſwaded that they are in the fauour of God. You will ſay it is true Perſwaſion: But I ſay if forme make truth, they are as formally, and therefore as truly perſwaded of it as the godly. If the Godly then are therefore and for this cauſe iuſtified, becauſe they are ſtrongly perſwaded they are Iuſtified, then why ſhould not the wicked likewiſe bee iuſtified by his ſtrong Perſwaſion. But in truth theſe kind of ſpeeches are vnreaſonable, and ſenſeleſſe, and ſo that opinion cannot be reaſonable.

N. B.

Many die and are ſaued that haue not a full Perſwaſion and aſſurance of their Saluation, yet are ſaued by Faith. I will anſwer you when you ſhew mee the man that ſo did die and was ſaued, and How you know that hee had at his death no full Aſſurance of his Saluation in Chriſt Ieſu, and yet had Faith, and when you proue that there is at the houre of death (when the elect are made without ſpot or wrinkle) in the Saints of God a doubtfull Faith.

I. D.

That many Reprobates and wicked men are ſtrongly perſwa-

perſwaded they are in the grace and fauor of God, nothing is more cleere and manifeſt. *There is a generation*, ſaith Salomon, *that are cleane in their owne eyes, and yet are not waſhed from their filthineſſe.* And the Angell of the Church of *Laodicea* ſaith of himſelfe that hee *is rich, and growne to great wealth, and had need of nothing*; and yet in the iudgement of him that is Amen, *the faithfull and true witneſſe, was wretched, and miſerable, and poore, and blind, and naked.* Yea, *Experience it ſelfe*, ſaith Caluin, *ſheweth, that Reprobates ſometime are affected with the like feeling almoſt that the elect are, that in their owne iudgement they differ nothing at all from the Elect.* Such is the deceitfulneſſe of mans heart, and the blindneſſe of his ſelfe-loue, that it makes him eaſily ouerweene himſelfe, and to promiſe peace vnto his ſoule when hee is in the ready way vnto deſtruction. You will ſay that the Perſwaſion of the Reprobate and wicked, is built vpon a falſe and erronious ground, and therfore is Preſumption rather then true Aſſurance. For anſwer hereunto conſider, that the Elect of God before his Iuſtification is but a wicked man, whence Diuines vſe to call it, The Iuſtification of the wicked, warranted therein by that of Saint Paul, *To him that worketh not, but beleeueth in him that iuſtifieth the wicked, his faith is imputed vnto righteouſneſſe.* Conſider moreouer that Faith as a cauſe goeth before Iuſtification, for wee are iuſtified by Faith: and therefore if the Elect bee wicked before his iuſtification, hee muſt needs much more bee wicked before the firſt act of his Beleeuing. In regard whereof Saint Auguſtin ſaith, *Know thou that Faith when it was giuen thee found thee a ſinner.* Theſe things being ſo, as without controuerſie they are, I then de-

Prou. 30. 12.
Reu. 3. 17.
Verſ. 14.
Verſ. 17.
Inſt. l. 3. c. 2. §. 11.
Rom. 4. 5.
Rom. 3. 28.
Enar. in Pſ. 31.

mand of you, if Faith bee Assurance, what ground hath the Elect for his Assurance in the first Act of his Faith, more then the Reprobates and wicked haue? Certainly vnlesse you will flye with the Anabaptists vnto I know not what Enthusiasms and sudden reuelations, grounded vpon no arguments, formerly by the Holy Ghost imprinted in the soule, you cannot possibly shew any: seeing before Faith they lie together in the same masse of corruption, and are alike liable vnto eternall damnation. Now vnto this argument thus enlarged and explaned, let vs see what answer you returne.

When I can shew the man that died without Assurance and was saued, and how I know at his death hee had no full Perswasion, and can proue that there is at the houre of death in the Saints a Doubtfull Faith, then (you say) *you will answer mee.* What *M. Baxter*, and not till then? Suppose I cannot satisfy your demands (as indeed who knoweth what is in the heart of man at the houre of his death?) shall my argument therefore for euer stand vnanswered? And yet *M. Perkins* telleth you that, *When a Professor of the Gospell shall despaire at his end, men are to leaue secret iudgements vnto God, and charitably iudge the best of him:* and hee instanceth in one *M. Chambers*, who in his sickneſse grieuously despaired, and cried out that hee was damned, yet, saith hee, *it is not for any to note him with the blacke marke of a Reprobate.* The like censure elsewhere giueth he of *Francis Spiera*: Yea further, saith hee, *When a Professor of the Gospell shall make away himselfe, though it bee a fearefull case, yet still the same opinion must bee carried.* So that it seemes by this learned mans iudgement (who for ought I know is not singular herein but followeth the common opinion of other.

Declar. of Spir. Desert.

other Diuines) that it is possible for a man to die in Faith and so to bee saued, and yet to die in Despaire and so without Assurance: whence it followeth necessarily that Faith is not Assurance.

But this answer of yours, brings mee in minde of a pretie Epigram of *Nicarchus*, which you may read in the Greeke anthologie. A deafe man commences sute against another deafe man, before a deafe iudge: the plaintife pleads, that the defendant owes him fiue months rent for his house, the defendant answers for himselfe that hee had been grinding at mill all night, the Iudge looking vpon them, why contend yee thus good fellowes, quoth hee: is shee not mother to you both? then keepe her both hardly. Semblable hereunto is your answer, for as if you were as blind as they were deafe, and had not eyes in your head to read my writing, when I speake of onions, as it is in the Prouerbe, you answer of garlicke, and roue the whole heauen wide from the marke you should shoot at. I say that the *wicked may bee strongly perswaded, and therefore Faith is not a Perswasion*, you like the deafe defendant reply that you haue beene grinding at mill all night, telling mee I shall then receiue answer when I shew the man that died without Perswasion and yet was saued by Faith, and other such stuffe of the same stampe. Verily, I am perswaded if old *Sibyl* or *Oedipus* or any other that hath anciently been esteemed for reading riddles should reuiue againe, yet would they not bee able with all their cunning, to deuise how to accommodate and fit this answer to any part of my argument. For mine owne part I can make of it, nor fish, nor flesh, nor good red herring, and therefore not troubling my selfe with your follies here I

Antholog. l. 2. ὁἰς κωφὸς.

leaue it as I found it, vnkith, vnkist as they say.

N. B.

And in the meane time I will hasten to your Definition of Faith, which you call the third kinde of Faith and onely Iustifying Faith.

L. D.

Soft and faire, no hast but good: you post away so fast vnto the Definition, that you leaue something behind you vnanswered which desires and deserues your further consideration. For first I proue vnto you that Faith cannot be a full Perswasion & certaine Assurance, partly because it is not so much as Assurance, partly because such Fulnes agrees not to little Faith, and so makes the definition narrower and of lesse latitude then the definite, and partly because it is a most discomfortable doctrine to weake Christians, who finding this strength of Assurance wanting in themselues, may doubt whether they haue any Faith at all, if Faith bee no other then a full Assurance and firme resolution. Againe, I answer certaine obiections the chiefest you can haue against mee, and that with such generall solutions as will cut off almost any reason you can oppose vnto mee. These things being of such importance and consequence should not thus haue beene balked and hustit vp in silence: for while they stand vnstirred and vntoucht you cannot reasonably bee thought either fully to haue satisfied my arguments, or sufficiently to haue maintained your owne cause. Out of doubt therefore it would haue been much better for your credit to haue made lesse hast, and more

good.

good ſpeed: for tripping away ſo faſt; and leauing matters of ſuch weight vtterly vnanſwered, all the Schollers in our Countrey (to blow backe your owne ſcoffe into your owne face) will thinke the worſe of your haſte ſo long as they liue for this tricke.

To conclude this point, whereas there are two many faults as *Simplicius* ſaith, too vſually committed in the diſputation and determination of Queſtions: it appeareth by what I haue now ſaid that you haue hitherto groſſely faulted in the former. For you doe but reiect and deny my Concluſions, without refuting the confirmations I bring for them: and ſo if not altogether alienate from you, yet leaue in ſuſpence and doubt the mind euen of thoſe who otherwiſe might bee of the ſame opinion with you. Now if you offend likewiſe in the ſecond, and doe not in the remainder of your Reply, vtterly raze and ouerthrow the foundations of my Doctrine, but ſuffer them to ſtand vnſhaken and vnmoued: you ſhall both leaue the thirſt of your readers expectation vnquenched and vnſatisfied, and proue your ſelfe but a bragging and boaſting *Pyrgopolinices*, threatning much and performing nothing. Let vs therefore take a view hereof, and ſee what you haue to ſay againſt the definition which I giue to Iuſtifying Faith.

Treatiſe.

The third Faith is Faith of Perſon or Perſonall Merit; and of this Faith, I make the Obiect to bee Chriſt the Mediator meriting, the *Fiducia* a Reſt or Deuolution, the Subiect of it, the facultie of the Will not the Vnderſtanding, the next end of it Iuſtification, the remote

end eternall ſaluation, and I thus define it, A reſt of the will vpon Chriſt and his merits for iuſtification and conſequently ſaluation.

I. D.

Becauſe you complaine anon that the word Reſt which I haue made to bee the iuſtifying act of Faith is ambiguous, and thereupon it pleaſeth you in your Anſwers following to take aduantage and make you merry with the Equiuocation thereof: you ſhall giue me leaue before I ſtep a foot further in a few words, and a little more plainely to open my meaning touching that Act. And to this end, ſeeing to proue that Faith is an Affiance or Reſt, I reported me in my Treatiſe vnto the words vſed in the originall of the old Teſtament, as בטח חסה, and the formes of words vſed in the new, as to beleiue in, to hope in, or as in ſome tranſlations it is read to beleiue on, to hope on: I will firſt ſhew that theſe tearmes applied vnto Chriſt the right Obiect of Faith, import that very Act whereby wee ſtand iuſtified before God, and ſecondly I will diligently inquire and ſearch out what may bee the true, proper, and naturall meaning of theſe tearmes, both which being cleerely demonſtrated, it will manifeſtly appeare both what that Reſt is which I make to be the iuſtifying Act of Faith, and how fondly and vainely you cauill and dally with the ambiguity thereof.

That Beleiuing in or vpon importeth that Act is in it ſelfe ſo apparant, that I thinke no ſober man will deny it: but becauſe to you a man muſt proue that the Sunne ſhines thus I demonſtrate it. *That which is imputed for righteouſ-*

righteousneſſe, and by which wee are iuſtified, is the true Act of Iuſtifying Faith. This you cannot deny, vnleſſe you will turne Papiſt: for our Religion will not permit you to ioyne any other companion with Faith in the matter of Iuſtification. But ſuch beliquing is imputed for righteouſneſſe, and is that by which we are iuſtified: ſo ſaith the Apoſtle, *To him that beleeueth in him that iuſtifieth the wicked his Faith is counted for righteouſneſſe*, and againe, *Wee haue beleeued in Ieſus Chriſt, that wee might bee iuſtified by the Faith of Chriſt*. Adde hereunto that whereas the ſame Apoſtle ſaith *With the heart man beleeueth vnto righteouſneſſe*, forthwith in the next verſe hee interpreteth that Beleeuing by Beleeuing in. For ſaith hee, *the Scripture ſaith, whoſoeuer beleeueth in him ſhall not bee aſhamed*. Wherefore I conclude that to Beleeue is the Iuſtifying Act of Faith. So alſo is Hoping in or vpon, being in effect the ſame with Beleeuing in. For although Hope and Faith bee in nature two diſtinct Graces, and ſo reckoned by Saint *Paul*; yet ſeeing by reaſon of the neere affinity betweene them, Hope is ſometime put for Faith, it may not ſeeme ſtrange that to hope in, is alſo vſed for to beleeue in. Now that Hope is ſometime put for Faith appeareth by that of Saint Peter, *Bee ready alwayes to giue an anſwer to euery man that asketh you a reaſon of the Hope that is in you*; where Hope, as *Calvin* ſaith, *is by a Synechdoche taken for Faith*. And as manifeſt is it by Saint *Paul* that to Hope in, is no other then to Beleeue in; for hauing ſaid, *That wee ſhould bee vnto the praiſe of his glory who firſt hoped in Chriſt, In whom alſo yee hoped hauing heard the Word of Truth, the Goſpell of your Saluation*, by and by hee adds by way of interpretation, *In whom alſo Beleeuing*

Rom. 4. 5.

Rom. 10. 10.

V. 11.

1 Pet. 3. 15.

In eum: loc.

Eph. 1. 12, 13.

wing yee were ſealed with the holy Spirit of Promiſe. In a word, the Act of Hope properly taken is expectation or looking out for the performance or comming of a thing: but Hoping in, imports Affiance or truſting on ſomething for the performance thereof. As touching the words of the old Teſtament חסה גלל בטח, firſt I find חסה and גלל confounded with בטח as words of the ſame ſignification, they being after the manner of Scripture ioyned together in the ſame verſe as equipollent the one to explane and expound the other: for example, *It is better*, ſaith *Dauid*, לחסות *to truſt in the Lord* מבטח *then to put confidence in man*, and גול *Roll thy way vpon the Lord*, בטח *and truſt vpon him.* But בטח it ſelfe is in the ſame manner confounded with האמין, which conſtrued with the Propoſition ב ſignifieth to Believe in, and is by your owne confeſſion the very Act of iuſtifying Faith: for example, לא האמינו באלהים *they believed not in God*, לא בטחו בישועתו *and truſted not in his ſalvation*, and אל תאמינו ברע *Believe not in a friend*, אל תבטחו באלוף *truſt not in a Prince.* Againe that which in the old Teſtament is vttered by one of theſe words, the ſame in the new is expreſſed by Believing in: for example, בשמו *We truſt in the Name of his Holineſſe* ſaith the old Teſtament, *Hee that believeth in his Name* ſaith the new; בטח *truſt in the Lord with thy whole heart* ſaith the old, *If thou Believe with thy whole heart* ſaith the new: finally, In thee O Lord חסיתי, *haue I truſted let mee not be confounded* ſaith the old, *Hee that Believeth in him ſhall not bee aſhamed* ſaith the new. If you except againſt this laſt parallell, that the Apoſtle hath reference vnto that of *Eſay* המאמין לא יחיש. *Hee that Believeth maketh not haſt,*

Pſal. 118. 8. Pſal. 37. 5.

Pſal. 78. 22. Mic. 7. 5.

Pſal. 33. 21. Ioh. 1. 12. 1 Ioh. 3. 23. 5. 13. Prou. 3. 5. Act. 8. 37. Pſal. 25. 2. Pſal. 31. 1. Rom. 10. 11.

haſte, rather vnto thoſe paſſages of the Pſalmes aboue quoted: I anſwer with *Beza* that it is not likely, partly becauſe the vniuerſall particle, and the word in him is not to bee found in the Prophet, partly becauſe the Apoſtle ſaith not as the Phophet *Eſay* doth, maketh not haſte, but preciſely accordeth with the words of the Prophet *Dauid*, ſaying, *ſhall not bee confounded nor aſhamed*. Howſoeuer, ſeeing in all theſe places the ſame thing is intended and meant, it is cleere that חסה, בטח, האמין, and Belieuing in, are Synonyma, differing in name, but not in definition: and ſo I conclude what aboue I vndertooke to demonſtrate, that all theſe tearmes properly import the Iuſtifying act of Faith. In ad Ro. 10. 11.

In the next place are wee to inquire the right acception and ſignification of theſe words, that wee may more perfectly conceiue, what that *Fiducia* or Reſt is, which wee haue made to bee that Act. And firſt חסה as *R. Kimchi* obſerueth, properly and primitiuely ſignifieth *to retire into ſome ſafe place for ſhelter or harbor*: ſo is it vſed in ſundry places, חסו בצלי באו *Come*, ſaith the bramble in the booke of Iudges, *ſhelter or couer you vnder my ſhadow*; and the Prophet Dauid in the Pſalmes בצל כנפיך אחסה *I will retire mee vnder the ſhadow of thy wings*. And hence is it, that מחסה a Noune, deriued from this root, ſignifieth a place of refuge or protection, as where *Dauid* ſaith סלעים מחסה לשפנים *the rocks are refuge for the conies*, and Eſay, *Thou haſt been a fortreſſe to the poore, a fortreſſe to the needy in his trouble*, מחסה מזרם *a refuge from the ſtorme or inundation*. So that this word referred vnto Chriſt betokeneth that Act whereby wee betake our ſelues vnto him as vnto the only Sanctuary, where wee may bee preſerued ſafe from Iudg. 9. 15. Pſal. 57. 1. Pſal. 104. 18. Eſa. 4. 6.

the tempest of Gods displeasure, which cannot be but by iustification from our sinnes, according to that of the Psalmist, Psal. 2. 12. *If his wrath burne yea but a little*, כל־חסיבי *blessed are all they that retire themselues to him.* Vpon which place learned *Iunius* notes, that that retiring vnto God (which is there affirmed to be the cause of our blessednes) is no other then sincere Faith. The next word is גלל which signifieth to Roll: whence commeth גליל a Circle or Ring, and גלגל a Spheare or Wheele; because as the cube easily setleth and stayeth vpon one side; so the Spherical and round figure is euer subiect to rolling & turning. Being ioined with the Preposition, על it signifies to Deuolue or Roll vpon a thing, either to oppresse it and beare it downe, as where *Iosephs* brethren say, *Weare brought hither* עלינו רלהתגלל עלינו Gen. 43. 18. *to roll and cast himselfe vpon vs*, and Iob גלל Iob. 30. 14. *they roll themselues vpon mee*: or to bee supported and borne vp by it, as in the place of Psalmes aboue cited, and that of the Prouerbs, Prou. 16. 3. גל אל יהוה מעשיך *Roll thy works vpon the Lord and thy thoughts shall bee established.* Agreeable whereunto is that of the Psalmist though vsing another word השלך על יהוה Psal. 55. 23. *Cast thy burden vpon the Lord and hee shall sustaine thee, hee will not suffer the righteous to bee moued for euer.* This then applied vnto Christ intimates vnto vs our fleeting & vnsetled estate, and the restlesnesse of our soules vntill wee come vnto him, according to that of Saint Augustin, *Thou hast made vs for thy selfe, and our hearts are vnquiet till they rest in thee*: and so imports that Act whereby being heauy loden with our sinnes, and seeking to bee eased of them, at length wee discharge our lode and rest our selues vpon him. The third word is בטח, which signifieth

ſignifieth to put confidence, truſt, Affiance in or vpon a thing, and as *Mercer* ſaith *firmiter inniti*, firmely to leane or reſt vpon a thing. Hereupon you ſhall often-times find it ioyned with שען properly ſignifying to leane on, whence alſo commeth משען a ſtaffe becauſe men vſe to leane on it and to ſupport themſelues by it: as for example, תבטח *yee truſt in fraud and ſtabborneſſe*, ſaith Eſay, והשענתם עליו *and leane vpon it*, and againe, יבטח בשם יהוה וישען באלהיו *Let him truſt on the Name of the Lord, and leane vpon his God.* And to this word had I ſpeciall regard, when I defined Faith by *Fiducia* or Reſt, as appeareth by that in my Treatiſe I make the Act of *Fiducia*, to be *Inniti*, to leane vpon, which yet I therefore rendred reſt, becauſe in our Engliſh tranſlations it is vſually ſo turned, as for example, that of the Prophet *Hanani* vnto King *Aſa*, בהשענך על מלך ארם ולא נשענת על יהוה אלהיך is thus engliſhed, *Becauſe thou haſt reſted vpon the King of Aram, and not reſted in the Lord thy God*, and againe in the next verſe בהשענך, *Becauſe thou didſt reſt vpon the Lord.* So then this word in the matter of Iuſtification deſigneth that Act whereby finding that wee are weake and feeble, vnable to ſupport our ſelues, we make Ieſus Chriſt our ſtaffe, ſtaying and reſting our ſelues vpon him, according to that of *Dauid* יהוה למשען לי *the Lord was as a ſtaffe vnto mee.* The laſt word is *meda'am ait* to Belieue in, or vpon: for as for that other of Hoping in, becauſe it may ſeeme to bee rather the Act of Hope then of Faith, or but Catachreſtically vſed when it is put for Belieuing in, I vtterly omit it. What is it then to belieue in, or on? Let the Holy Ghoſt (whoſe phraſe it is) declare his owne meaning. *Behold*,

In the ſtudio Pagn.

Eſa. 30. 12. Eſa. 50. 10.

2 Chron. 16. 7. Verſ. 8.

Pſal. 18. 19.

saith the Apostle *Peter* out of the Prophet *Esay*, *I lay in Sion a cheefe corner-stone, chosen, and precious; and he that believeth thereon, shall not bee ashamed.* To Believe on a stone seemeth an insolent and vnusuall speech: but it is no other then (as the Apostle expresseth himselfe) to come as liuing stones vnto the corner-stone, and to lay and build our selues vpon it, that wee may bee made a spirituall house, which in effect is the same with that Retiring and Resting wee haue aboue spoken of; as will yet farther appeare if wee compare this place with the like of the Prophet *Dauid*; for whereas here it is said, *He that believeth thereon shall not bee ashamed*, there the Psalmist deliuereth it thus, *They that looke vnto him, and run vnto him their faces shall not bee ashamed.* But if you would yet more fully and plainely vnderstand what it is to Believe in, or vpon a thing, then read and consider that most sweet and comfortable speech of Saint *Iohn* in his Gospell; *As many*, saith hee, *as receiued him, to them hee gaue power to be the Sonnes of God, that is to them that Believe in his Name.* Lo, to Believe in Christ, saith the holy Apostle, is to receiue Christ: and therefore if wee may know what it is to receiue Christ, wee shall also know what it is to believe in him. Receiuing is a word of Relation and answereth vnto Offering: for what is not offered is rather taken then receiued. To offer Christ vnto any is the Act of God onely: to receiue Christ, is the Act onely of the Elect of God. God offereth Christ vnto vs, when either outwardly by the publike preaching of the Word, or inwardly by the secret knocking of his spirit, he counselleth and aduiseth vs to acknowledge that Iesus is the Mediator, and to admit of him for our Mediator. And wee againe receiue Christ so offered

1 Pet. 2. 6. Esa. 28. 16.

1 Pet. 2. 4. 5.

Psal. 33. 5.

Ioh. 1. 12.

vnto,

vnto vs when as being conuinced and perſwaded by the Word and Spirit, wee acknowledge him in generall to bee the Mediator, and admit him in particular to bee our Mediator: So that there is a double Receiuing of Chriſt, the one is by the Vnderſtanding, the other is by the Will: Chriſt is receiued by the Vnderſtanding when wee Beleeue hiſtorically, yeelding and aſſenting vnto the truth of the Goſpell, the ſumme wherof is that Ieſus is the Christ; For when the Apoſtle ſaith, *This is a true ſaying and by all meanes worthy to bee receiued, that Chriſt Ieſus came into the world to ſaue ſinners*, what can hee meane by receiuing other then aſſenting that it is true? and when our Sauiour ſaith vnto the Apoſtle, *They will not receiue thy witneſſe concerning me*, what elſe can he vnderſtand then this, that they would not giue credit vnto his teſtimony, concerning Redemption and Saluation by Chriſt? This Receiuing though it bee of ſuch abſolute neceſſity vnto life, that no man can poſſibly be ſaued without it: yet is it not of ſuch power and efficacy, that whoſoeuer ſo receiueth ſhall infallibly bee ſaued. For as we haue ſhewed, *The Diuels ſo beleeue and tremble*: and many who are *inlightned, and haue receiued the knowledge of the truth, periſh*, notwithſtanding eternally in their ſinnes. Beſides therefore this Receiuing of Chriſt by the Vnderſtanding, there is a Receiuing of him alſo by the Will, which is done by particular application, when in the ſincerity of our hearts we accept and make choice of him alone to bee our Mediator, that is to ſay, to bee vnto vs a Prophet, a Prieſt, and a King. Wee accept him to bee our Prophet, when wee admit him to be our teacher, and abſolutely ſubmit our ſelues vnto his teaching. Wee accept him to bee our Prieſt,

1 Tim. 1. 15.

Act. 22. 18.

Iam. 2. 19. Heb. 6. 4. & 10. 26.

when wee reſt and repoſe our ſelues vpon his Sacrifice and interceſſion for the waſhing away of our ſinnes. Finally, wee accept him to bee our King, when wee put our ſelues wholly and onely vnder his gouernment, and ſubiect our wils vnto his will, deſiring that in all things it alone may bee done by vs. And this accepting of Chriſt by the Will, is that very Receiuing of him which Saint *Iohn* here meaneth. For firſt, whoſoeuer thus accepteth of him hath without queſtion withall beſtowed on him the ſame power and prerogatiue, which hee affirmeth to bee giuen to as many as receiue him, namely to bee made the Sonnes of God. Againe, that Receiuing is vnderſtood which is oppoſed vnto the Iewes not-Receiuing: for hauing ſaid, *He came vnto his owne*, that is vnto the Iewes, *and his owne receiued him not*, immediatly it is added, *But as many as receiued him, &c.* How then did the Iewes not receiue him? onely in not aſſenting vnto this that hee was the Meſſias? Indeed this was the ground why ſundry of them receiued him not: but their not-receiuing of him was no other then that Act of their Will, whereby they refuſed to ſubmit themſelues vnto him as vnto the Meſſias. This doth our Sauiour intimate, when hee ſaith vnto them, *I am come in my Fathers Name and you receiue mee not: if another come in his owne Name, him Will you receiue*, that is, him will you admit and accept for your Meſſias. But plainly doth hee expreſſe it when in the Parable hee bringeth them in, reſolutely and directly ſaying, Wee will not haue this man raigne ouer vs: as alſo when hee ſaith vnto them, *How often would I haue gathered thy children together as the hen gathereth her chickens vnder her wings, and yee would not.* Beſides, diuerſe there were of them,

Ioh. 1. 12.

Ioh. 1. 11.

Ioh. 5. 43.

Luc. 19. 14.
Mat. 23. 37.

euen

euen of the Scribes, and Phariſees, and Prieſts who knew right well, that hee was the Chriſt; for ſo much doe the Husbandmen themſelues cõfeſſe in the Parable, when they ſay, This is the Heire: and how could our Sauiour iuſtly charge them with that irremiſſible ſinne againſt the Holy Ghoſt, vnleſſe they had knowne him to bee ſo? Theſe then knowing him to bee the Meſſias, and yet not receiuing him, what can this not-receiuing be other then their willfull reiecting and refuſing of him againſt their knowledge and against their conſcience. Vpon all which it followeth that this being not-receiuing, receiuing oppoſed thereunto muſt needs bee that Act of the Will whereby wee accept of Chriſt to bee our Mediator, that is to ſay, our Prophet to inſtruct vs, our Prieſt to make atonement for vs, our King to rule and gouerne vs. And becauſe Belieuing and Receiuing are (as we haue ſhewed) all one, it followeth alſo neceſſarily that to Belieue in Chriſt is nothing elſe then ſo to accept him. Mat. 21. 38. Mat. 22. 30. 31.

To grow therefore at length vnto an iſſue, you ſee that according to promiſe I haue demonſtrated vnto you, firſt, that thoſe tearmes both of the old and new Teſtament mentioned in my Treatiſe import that Act of Faith whereby wee ſtand iuſtified before God: ſecondly, what is the true, proper, and naturall meaning and ſignification of theſe tearmes: and that therefore thirdly by the word Reſt, in my Definition I vnderſtand no other thing then that which theſe words import and ſignify. Wherefore I muſt intreate you in the reſidue of your Reply to ſpeake vnto this meaning: otherwiſe you ſhall but ſpend your breath in vaine, and wreſtle not with mee, but with your owne ſhadow. Neuertheleſſe if

any

any ſhall thinke it fitter inſteed of the word Reſt, to ſubſtitute any other of theſe tearmes, I forbid him not: for ſo doing he ſhall differ from mee in word onely, and not in ſenſe. And to ſpeake ingenuouſly and freely, ſeeing to expreſſe the Act of Faith ſpeciall choice is made in the New Teſtament of Belieuing in, or vpon, and this againe is expounded by ſuch Receiuing as is before deſcribed: happily it were not amiſſe aboue all the reſt to preferre this, and to define Faith by that *Act of the Will whereby wee accept Chriſt to bee our Mediator for iuſtification and conſequently Saluation.* The rather becauſe it ſeemes more fully and plainely to ſet forth the nature of that Act by which wee are iuſtified, and more apt and fit to reſolue many doubts which may be moued touching iuſtification. For as *Vrſinus*, a right worthy Diuine, obſerueth, *Faith iuſtifieth no otherwiſe then as it is an acceptation and application of the merit of Chriſt, which is the proper Act of Faith alone, and ſo very Faith it ſelfe.* Theſe things thus premiſed: let vs now in the Name of God proceed to the examination of what you haue replied and oppoſed againſt my definition.

Admonit. de lib. Concord.

N. B.

I anſwer, a man may reſt his will vpon Chriſt and his merits, and yet bee damned for want of Sanctification, and ſo conſequently may bee damned hauing Iuſtifying Faith, which is abſurd, therefore is your Definition abſurd.

I. D.

Here, *Maſter Baxter*, and in the reſt of your anſwers

wers inſuing, you waue & flote vp and downe like a boat in a ſtorme without a Pilote, anſwering tumultuarily what euer comes next to head, and ſcorning like another *Caſſius Seuerus* to keep either in method your matter, or modeſtie in your words. But as you lead the dance, ſo muſt I needs follow. Thus therefore you argue. *No man can be damned hauing iuſtifying Faith, A man may be damned reſting his will vpon Chriſt & his merits*, Ergo, *Reſting of the will vpon Chriſt and his merits is not iuſtifying Faith:* The Maior I grant, the Minor thus you confirme, *Hee that wanteth ſanctification may bee damned, A man reſting his will vpon Chriſt and his merits may want ſanctification*; Ergo, *a man reſting his will vpon Chriſt and his merits may be damned.* The Maior againe I grant, if you vnderſtand it either thus, *Hee that finally wanteth ſanctification ſhall bee damned*, or thus, *Hee that wanteth preſent ſanctification is for the preſent in the ſtate of damnation:* for otherwiſe the Elect vntill their effectuall vocation want ſanctification, and yet ſhall neuer actually be damned. The Minor you barely affirme but confirme not: thinking it as it ſeemes proofe inough if you ſay it and ſubſcribe thereunto Witneſſe our ſelfe: vnto this argument therefore I anſwer two things.

Tacit. vel potiùs Quintil. de cauſſ. corrupt. eloq.

Firſt, that you are a very vnkind and vngratefull man that hauing now the third or fourth time borowed arguments of me to ſerue your need, haue not the good manners to ſay mee God a mercy for it, or to acknowledge to whom you haue beene beholding. For in my Treatiſe thus I obiected againſt my ſelfe, *If Faith be Affiance then the wicked may haue it: for Balaam deſired to die the death of the Righteous, and ſome receiue the Word with ioy believing for a time.* And vnto this obiection in the ſame

Treatiſe I gaue a ſufficient and full ſolution, diſtinguiſhing betweene that Affiance which is ſleight and ſuperficiall, and that which is ſetled and grounded, as there you may read more at large, for thither I referre you.

Hecub. act. 2. But becauſe, as *Euripides* ſaith, the ſame ſpeech ſpoken by diuerſe perſons is not alike entertained: peraduenture this anſwer would be better accepted if you might haue it from the mouth of greater authority. Read then *M. Perkins* expoſition of the Creed, whereupon the firſt word I Beleeue hee intreats of the nature of Faith, and you ſhall find in effect the ſame obiection in like manner anſwered, and diſtinction made betweene the *fleeting motions & deſires* of them who liue ſtill in their ſins & after the courſe of the world & the *Deſire of reconciliation* that comes from a bruzed heart, & brings with it alwayes reformation & amendment of life. This ſolution howſoeuer now you haue cunningly diſſembled, yet I muſt pray you the next time not to ouerſlip it: for otherwiſe you ſhall bee counted but a miching diſputer, and no whit at all diſaduantage your aduerſary, fighting againſt him with no better weapon then a ruſty ſword both edge and point rebated.

Secondly, I anſwer vnto your Minor negatiuely, denying that ſuch *Reſting of the will vpon Chriſt and his merits*, as wee haue deſcribed, and in the definition vnderſtand, can at any time bee ſeparated from Sanctification. For beſides that it is contrary vnto your owne Poſitions, as anon in the due place ſhall bee obſerued: it is alſo flatly repugnant vnto the rules of holy Scripture. For doth not the Scripture pronounce them all, *Bleſſed,*

Pſal. 2. 12. Pſal. 25. 2. Pſal. 125. 1. *that retire themſelues vnto the Lord?* that *they ſhall not bee aſhamed that put their truſt in him?* that *they ſhall be*

like

like vnto mount Sion which can neuer bee remoued, but ſtandeth faſt for euermore? that *to reſt vpon the Lord is to bee of a perfect heart?* Finally, doth it not affirme that *whoſoeuer receiueth Chriſt and believeth in him, is the Son of God, is iuſtified before God, hath euerlaſting life, is borne of God, is led by the Spirit of God, and walketh not after the fleſh, but after the Spirit?* vnleſſe therefore vtterly ſtripping your ſelfe of all modeſty you will put on the forehead of an harlot, and ſay that all theſe things may bee affirmed of the Vnſanctified man: how can you poſſibly auouch that a *man reſting his will vpon Chriſt, retiring vnto him, truſting on him, believing in him, and accepting of him to bee his Mediator, can be without ſanctification*, and for want thereof bee damned eternally? Nay, whoſoeuer *accepteth Ieſus Chriſt for his Mediator*, ſubmitteth himſelfe as wee haue ſhewed not onely vnto his Prophecy and Prieſthood, but alſo vnto his Kingdome: and if hee ſubmit himſelfe vnto his Kingdome, that is vnto his rule and gouernment, how can hee bee Vnſanctified? for the Vnſanctified man ſubiecteth himſelfe vnto the Fleſh, and not vnto the Spirit of Chriſt: where by the way you may obſerue, defining Faith in this ſort, how and after what manner it purifieth the heart, and begetteth in vs ſanctity and newneſſe of life: whereas defining it by Aſſurance as you doe, it doth not readily appeare how ſuch Aſſurance can bee the principle and reaſon of our Sanctification. True it is that Aſſurance may bee vnto vs a ſtrong motiue to proceed on in Sanctification and holyneſſe of life: but it is ſo farre from cauſing it, that it is rather cauſed by it. For by our holy life and conuerſation as by the fruites, doe wee neceſſarily gather that Faith which is the cauſe thereof is

2 Chron. 16. 8. 9.
Ioh. 1. 12.
Rom. 4. 5.
Ioh. 3. 36.
1 Ioh. 5. 1.
Rom. 8. 1. 14.
Act. 15. 9.

in vs, and ſo grow to an Aſſurance of our Iuſtification and preſent ſtate in grace. In regard whereof Saint *Peter*, as it is in the vulgar tranſlation and ſome Greeke copies, commandeth *by good works to make our calling and election ſure*. And although in ſundry copies and tranſlations By good works is omitted: yet the addition thereof miſliketh not *Beza*, and *Fulke* confeſſeth that the circumſtance of the place doth of neceſſity require, that good works bee vnderſtood though they bee not expreſſed in the text. On the other ſide if you define Faith with mee to bee that Act whereby wee accept and make choice of Chriſt to bee our Mediator, that is to ſay, our Prophet, Prieſt, and King: who ſeeth not that this Faith working in vs a free and voluntary ſubiection vnto the Kingdom of Chriſt, is the very purifier of our hearts, and the cauſe of all our holy ſtudies and indeuours? whence alſo it appeareth what the reaſon is why our Sauiour vnto beleeuing in the Sonne oppoſeth Diſobedience vnto him when hee ſaith, *Hee that beleeueth in the Sonne hath euerlaſting life: and hee that obeyeth not the Sonne ſhall not ſee life, but the wrath of God abideth on him*: namely becauſe as Acceptation of him to bee our King is the root of all Obedience, ſo the reiection and refuſall of him to bee our King is the very ſource of all Rebellion and Diſobedience.

2 Pet. 1. 10.

In loc. prad. Ibid.

Ioh. 3. 36.

N. B.

Your Genus is, that Faith iuſtifying is a Reſt, which is falſe; when you ſpeake more learnedly I will deigne you farther anſwer.

I. D.

I. D.

That Reſt is not the Genus of Iuſtifying Faith I eaſily grant you: for as appeares manifeſtly in my Treatiſe, I make Affiance, or which is all one Reſt, to bee the Act or Forme of Faith, and not the Genus thereof. If I had thought it fitting to haue troubled the Definition therewith, I was not ſo ignorant but I could haue called it either an infuſed grace, or a gratious habit, or a Theologicall vertue: but becauſe the Philoſopher taught me that Habits are ſufficiently defined by their Acts in reference vnto their proper Obiects, I held it needleſſe to expreſſe it.

But ſuppoſe I had made it to be the right Genus, how doe you diſproue it? Forſooth it is ſufficient for ſuch a *Pythagoras* as you are to ſay it is falſe: & an inexpiable wrong would it be to demand a reaſon of your ſayings. Onely you adde, that *when I ſhall ſpeake more learnedly you will deigne me farther anſwer.* Brauely againe ſpoken, and *Alexander*-like: for neither would hee being a King contend with any but Kings, neither may you being ſo tranſcendent for your learning, and ſurmounting the moſt of men as farre as the Sun doth the leſſer lights, without impeachment of honour vouchſafe diſputation with any but your Peers, much leſſe with ſuch a one as is ſcarce to bee found in any Predicament. Yet ſeeing the Sunne ſo ſurpaſſing in glory is no way enuious of his light, but imparteth bountifully of his beames to the enlightning of the reſt of the ſtarres: it may pleaſe you alſo (with whom wiſdome muſt liue and dye) out of your benignity to ſend forth ſome influence of your learning vpon

Plut. in vitâ Alex.

Ioh. 12. 2.

vpon mee, that I may more cleerely diſcerne at leaſt in this queſtion betweene truth and that which is onely ſeeming ſo.

N. B.

Shew mee for your warrant one place of Scripture that ſo tearmeth it, any one Father of the Church, old or new, for theſe 1600. yeeres, Greeks or Latins, that will avouch it, and I will yeeld to your Genus. The Hebrew word for Faith, and the Greek word (whereof you haue heard before) doe vtterly condemne you, they both ſignifying a perſwaſion and an Aſſurance, and neuer a Reſt. I marueil you will teach the Holy Ghoſt to ſpeake, and the Church now to vnderſtand what Faith is, and that by ſuch a woodden Definition which may rather moue to choller then conſent.

I. D.

If by denying vnto mee the warrant of Scriptures, of Fathers old and new, Greeke and Latin, for 1600. yeeres and of the Greeke and Hebrew words for Faith, you intend to proue that Affiance or Reſt is not the Genus of Faith, it ſhall without more a-doo bee yeelded vnto you: for as appeares in the former ſection I make it to bee not the Genus but the Act or Forme thereof. But if you would thereby perſwade that Reſt or Affiance is not the Act of Faith, I muſt tell you that theſe reaſons are cleane out of date, and that you doe too much abuſe your Readers patience ſetting againe before him theſe Coleworts now more then twice ſodden. For both in the beginning of this diſputation, and in the laſt ſection ſaue two before this I haue throughly ſcanned & cleered this

this buſineſſe; ſhewing that I am ſo farre from *teaching the Holy Ghoſt to ſpeake, and the Church to vnderſtand what Faith is*, as you vnchriſtianly lay vnto my charge, that I vſe no other tearme, but that which the Spirit of God hath in Scripture ſanctified to this purpoſe, and the Holy Church hath euer ſpoken and vſed. But becauſe I am loth to peſter my paper with ſo many Tautologies and needles repetitions as you vſe to doe, thither muſt I entreate the courteous Reader to repaire for ſatisfaction.

In the meane ſeaſon, ſeeing both by expreſſe teſtimony of Scripture, and cleere euidence of reaſon I haue warranted euery part of my definition, and yet you without diſprouing the weakeſt of my proofes taunting-ly call it a *woodden Definition*: you muſt pardon mee if I tell you plainely that this wood-kinde of anſwering deſerues to bee reformed with a little woodden correction. But where you ſay my *Definition may rather moue to choler then conſent*, a man would thinke reading this your anſwer, that either your principles were ſo incurably hurt, or your braine dam'd and ram'd vp with ſuch a deale of dull and tough flegme, that it were as eaſy almoſt to remoue a mountaine as to moue you either to the one or the other. And yet indeed I find you of a cleene contrary complexion, euen the moſt pettiſh and waſpiſh gentleman that euer I met withall, euery ſmall & petty occaſion ſtirs your choler, and works you preſently out of temper. But becauſe I ſee it is your impotency & diſeaſe I beare with you the more, praying you notwithſtanding to haue as much patience as you may, if at times for the purging of this humor I play the Phyſician and miniſter ſome ſmall quantity of rheubarb vnto you. *N. B.*

N. B.

For alas, Master Downe, *what Rest can a man haue vpon Christ without Assurance to bee saued by his death and Passion and knowledge of his Lord and Sauiour. A full assurance therefore as a cause, worketh Rest vpon Christ as an effect, and is therefore the Generall word in the Definition of Iustifying Faith.*

I. D.

Y our argument if I mistake not standeth thus; *That which is an Effect of Assurance cannot be the Act of Faith, But Resting vpon Christ is an Effect of Assurance*, Ergo, *it cannot bee the Act of Faith.* I distinguish of Assurance, for it is either of the generall proposition, or of the Speciall and indiuiduall; of the Generall when wee are assured that, *Whosoeuer Belieueth on Christ shall bee iustified and saued*, of the Speciall when wee are certainly perswaded that *We are iustified and shall bee saued.* If you meane the former, then I deny the Maior: for such Historicall Assurance is a necessary pre-requisite vnto Iustifying Faith, and is the cause without which wee cannot belieue on Christ, and therefore that *which is such an effect of Assurance may bee the Act of Faith.* If you vnderstand the latter, then doe I grant the Maior: for if such Assurance be (as I haue demonstratiuely proued) it selfe the Effect of Faith, it is more then manifest that, *That which is an effect of such Assurance cannot bee the Act of Faith.* But then I deny the Minor, that *Resting vpon Christ, is an effect of such assurance:* affirming that contrarily

trarily Reſting vpon Chriſt is the cauſe of ſuch Aſſurance, and Aſſurance is the Effect of that Reſting.

But, what reſt, ſay you, can a man haue vpon Chriſt, without Aſſurance to be ſaued by his Death & Paſſion? Surely vnleſſe wee know his Death and Paſſion to bee the onely meanes of ſaluation, wee cannot reſt vpon him for it: but to ſay, that a man cannot reſt vpon him for ſaluation, vnleſſe hee know that hee is already tranſlated from death to life, is a moſt vnreaſonable and ſenſeleſſe ſpeech, as if a man might not truſt vnto his friend to doe ſomething for him, vntill he were ſure, it is already done. If you be ſo ſandblind in this preſent caſe that you cannot ſee how Reſt may goe before Aſſurance; yet I hope your ſight is not ſo much decayed but you may perceiue it through a paire of ſpectacles. Put caſe then that a skilfull and welknowne Phyſician ſhould offer freely to cure the diſeaſes of ſuch as are ſicke vpon condition they receiue Phyſicke of no other, but put themſelues wholly & abſolutely into his hands: doe you thinke it abſurd to become his patient, or that you cannot repoſe your ſelfe vpon his skill to bee cured by him, vnleſſe you be firſt aſſured that the cure is already done? Nay rather if you know well, that your health is perfectly recouered, you cannot rely vpon him, for that whereof you are fully poſſeſſed. Ieſus Chriſt the Archphyſician of our ſoules, as hee is knowne to bee all-ſufficient, and euery way able to heale our maladies, ſo doth hee louingly inuite all thoſe that are heauy loden to come vnto him, promiſing to refreſh them all vpon condition that renouncing themſelues and all others they ſet their whole Affiance on him for the remiſſion of their ſinnes. And dare you now make queſtion how a man

may betake himselfe into the hands of Christ, vntill he know that his sinnes bee already pardoned? Nay rather when wee know the debt is paid, and that according to the old rule *sinnes once remitted neuer returne againe*, we remaine thankefull for that which is past, and continue our Affiance on him for discharge of that which is to come. For (to obserue this by the way) wee may not thinke that in the first act of our conuersion and iustification we receiue actuall pardon of all our sinnes past, present, and to come, as some, and those of no meane marke haue rashly and vnaduisedly taught: for sinnes past only are then actually forgiuen, and sinnes to come onely in the destination and purpose of God. But neither doth God actually pardon the iustified man, nor the iustified man actually receiue pardon for his sinnes, vntill hee haue actually committed them, and renewed his Faith and Repentance for them. Neither let any man thinke that I speake this out of mine owne head, and without ground: for I am strongly backed herein by the warrant of Scripture, the euidence of reason, and the testimony of worthy men. By the warrant of Scripture: for that teacheth onely remission of sinnes past; so saith
Rom. 3. 25. Saint *Paul* in expresse tearmes, *God hath set forth Iesus Christ to bee a reconciliation through faith in his bloud, to declare his righteousnesse by the forgiuenesse of the sinnes that are passed*: By the euidence of reason, for if future sinnes as well as sinnes past bee actually remitted in our conuersion and first acceptation into grace, what need of Repentance, what need of Prayer that God would forgiue vs our trespasses? To repent and craue pardon of that whereof wee are not guilty, and which wee neuer committed, is palpable folly: and as great folly is it by

Repen-

Repentance and prayer to demand that of God which wee ſay wee are ſure hee hath long agoe beſtowed vpon vs: Finally, by the teſtimony of worthy men; for *Pardon*, ſaith Origen, *is of ſinnes paſt not future: Repentance*, ſaith Gregory Nyſſen, *is the diſſolution and deſtruction of ſinnes paſt. It is confeſſed by all truly godly and learned*, ſaith *Hierome, Zanchie, that the Saints to obtaine new remiſſion for a new ſinne haue need of a new act of Faith and Repentance, according to that ſaying ſo rife in Scripture, that by Faith men are iuſtified and haue their ſinnes remitted:* which when it is ſpoken of them that are come to yeeres of diſcretion, is alwayes to be vnderſtood of Actuall Faith, that is of the Act of Faith. Laſtly *Maſter Perkins*, when a Faithfull man grieuouſly ſinneth, the ſinne is indeed remitted in the deſtination of God: yet no remiſſion is actually either giuen by God, or receiued by man vntill hee repent. Nay if hee ſhould neuer repent (which yet is impoſſible) hee ſhould (as guilty of eternall death euen for this one ſin) be damned: for there is no new remiſſion of any new ſinne without a new act of Faith and Repentance. But inough of this point in this place though it bee of great importance, becauſe it is but by the way: only hence I gather that ſeeing Faith goeth before and Aſſurance neceſſarily commeth after remiſſion, that Faith is not Aſſurance.

In ad Rom. 3. De acerbè Iudicantib. Miſcell. lib. 3. pa. 97.

De prædeſt. & grat.

N. B.

I had rather ſay Faith were a labour then a Reſt: for it ſeeketh continually by ſanctification and holy loue to bring both body and ſoule vnto eternall reſt, and then Faith ceaſeth when eternall pacification and reſt is wrought in man.

I. D.

Thus you reaſon, Faith is a labour, Reſt is not a labour, *Ergo*, Faith is not a Reſt. The Maior you proue thus, That which worketh reſt is a labour, But Faith worketh reſt and ceaſeth when reſt is wrought, *Ergo*, Faith is a labour. The Minor you leaue naked and without proofe, ſuppoſing I thinke that no man vnleſſe bereft of his fiue wits would deny it, and hold that Reſt is a labour. Let vs therefore briefly examine them both. The Maior of your ſecond Syllogiſme preciſely and literally vnderſtood is not true: for that which worketh is the Agent or Labourer, and the Labourer cannot bee the Action or Labour. Whereupon it followeth, If that which worketh bee not a labour, And Faith as you aſſume worke, that therefore Faith is not a labor which is contradictory vnto the Maior of your firſt Syllogyſme. And yet as I grant not vnto you that Faith is a labour, ſo neither dare I peremptorily deny it: only I blame you for ſpeaking ſo confuſedly where it was neceſſary to vſe diſtinction. Know therefore that Faith as all other qualities whether acquired or infuſed may bee conſidered two wayes, either in the firſt act, (as Schooles vſe to ſpeake) or in the ſecond. The firſt act is the very habit of Faith inhering and ſticking in the ſoule: the ſecond is the immediate and proper operation and action thereof. If then you vnderſtand Faith in the firſt Act, and as it is an Habit, it is not a labour, but is imprinted in vs by the Holy Ghoſt, to the end that when oportunity is offered, and duty requireth, wee may by vertue thereof more ſweetly, readily, and eaſily worke, and labour. And ſo farre

far is it from being a labor it ſelfe, that oftentimes it lieth as it were idle & aſleep doing nothing at all vntill it pleaſe the Spirit of God to ſtirre vp our wils, and to quicken the ſparke hee hath put in vs, inabling vs thereby to coöperate with him. But if you vnderſtand Faith in the ſecond Act, and as it is in operation and action, then may you iuſtly call it a labour: for as our Sauiour ſaith, to beleeue in him whom the Father hath ſent is a Worke which God requireth vs to doe, in regard whereof the Apoſtle *Paul* calleth it the Worke of Faith. And becauſe Faith iuſtifieth, not as it is in the firſt, but in the ſecond act, that is not as it is an Habit, but as it is in action, accepting and applying vnto vs Chriſt and his merits, hence is it, ſaith *Bucer*, that Proteſtants vſually define it by a motion. Let the Maior therefore in this ſenſe bee granted vnto you.

Ioh. 6. 29.

1 Theſſ. 1. 3.

De iuſtific.

The Minor which you thinke to bee ſo cockſure I flatly deny, confidently affirming that Reſt is a labour: prouided, you vnderſtand no other Reſt then that which in my Treatiſe I haue expreſſed and declared. For if by Reſt you meane Quiet, ſuch Reſt without all queſtion is not Labour: for it is the end of labour, and a ceſſation from it, and therefore well did you ſay that, *when eternall reſt is wrought, then the labour of Faith ceaſeth.* But you cannot bee ignorant, that by Reſt I vnderſtand not Quiet, but Affiance, in as much as I render the Latin word *Fiducia* by it, and make the Act thereof to bee *Innixi*, which (as I haue ſhewed in ſome of our Engliſh tranſlations) is oftentimes turned by Reſting and Staying vpon. And this Reſt, that is, this Relying, this Repoſing, this Truſting or Beleeuing on Chriſt, is not a Quiet, but a motion or operation, and therefore a labour. True it is, that whoſoeuer commeth vnto Chriſt, and ſetteth

his whole Affiance vpon him, ſhall thereby finde refreſhment and Quiet vnto his ſoule: yet neuertheleſſe it is apparant that Affiance it ſelfe, is an act or motion of the Will, and not a Quiet, euen as the inclination of a mans ſelfe vpon his ſtaffe, or the laying of him downe vpon his bed is an action of the body. In a word remember what a little before I haue deliuered to cleare this tearme from all ambiguity, and take it in the ſame ſenſe which there I giue vnto it, and vnleſſe you will ſay. that light is darkneſſe you cannot but confeſſe that ſuch reſt is a labour, and ſo that notwithſtanding this argument, Faith may be a Reſt.

But now giue mee leaue to take vp the weapon which you are forced to lay downe, and to trie whether a blow therewith from my arme will pearce any deeper: for thus I retort your owne reaſon againſt you. *Faith is rather a labour then a reſt, Aſſurance is not ſo, but rather a reſt then a labour*, Ergo, *Faith is not Aſſurance*. The Maior is your owne, and you may not deny it. The Minor I proue thus, *Intellection or knowledge*, ſaith Ariſtotle, *is more like vnto reſt and quiet then vnto motion*: for although the mind while it is inquiring & ſeeking for knowledge is euer in motion and ſo laboureth, yet when the Habit of knowledge is once acquired and gotten, then is there no farther motion of the vnderſtanding thereunto, but a ſweet reſt and Quiet therein. Whereupon ſaith the ſame Philoſopher, *By the quieting & ſetling of the ſoule, doth a man become intelligent and wiſe*, meaning by Quiet, as *Iulius Scaliger* expoundeth him, nothing elſe but the aſſent of the minde. I aſſume, *But Aſſurance is ſuch intellection or knowledge*, for it is an *habituall aſſent* vnto this truth, that wee are in the preſent ſtate of grace and

Exerc. in Card. 307. 13.

ſhall

ſhall infallibly bee ſaued. Wherefore I conclude that *Aſſurance is rather a reſt or quiet then a labour:* whence alſo it farther followeth that *Faith*, being as you confeſſe *rather a labour, then a reſt*, cannot be *Aſſurance.*

Againe, Faith, you ſay, ceaſeth when eternall pacification and reſt is wrought. I grant: for the Obiect of Faith, as the Apoſtle ſaith, are things which are not ſeene, whereupon Saint *Auguſtin* elegantly, *Si vides non eſt Fides*, Beholding is not Believing. As therefore while we liue here in theſe earthly tabernacles, and are abſent from the Lord, *wee walke not by Sight, but by Faith:* ſo when wee ſhall be clothed vpon, and mortality ſhall bee ſwallowed vp of life, then ſhall *wee walke not by Faith, but by Sight.* Neither is the ceaſing of Faith any loſſe or diſaduantage, but an exchange for the better, namely viſion: for Seeing vnto Believing is, as the full brightneſſe of the Sunne is to the glimmering light of a candle. I aſſume then, *But Aſſurance ceaſeth not when eternall pacification and reſt is wrought:* for then the certainty of our Election, of our adoption, of our acceptation into grace, and finally of our Saluation is ſo farre from ceaſing, that it is by ſo much the more confirmed vnto vs, as intuitiue apprehenſion and the ſight of the eye is more infallible then heare-ſay or ſeeing by reflexion. I conclude therefore out of your owne principles, that *Faith ceaſing, and Aſſurance not ceaſing, Faith is not Aſſurance.* But as touching Affiance or Reſting vpon the mediation of Chriſt for iuſtification and Saluation, it is euident that that ceaſeth when wee ſhall haue obtained eternall reſt and pacification. For being perfectly quitted of our ſinnes, and in full poſſeſſion of Saluation, how can wee farther ſet our Affiance vpon him

Heb. 11. 1. & 2. Cor. 5. 4. 7. Verſ. 4.

him for it? Eſpecially ſeeing hee ſhall then ceaſe to bee vnto vs a Mediator of Redemption and Reconciliation, in regard whereof only hee is the Obiect of Affiance or Iuſtifying Faith, and ſhall bee vnto vs no otherwiſe then he is vnto the Elect Angels, a Mediatour of Conſeruation to confirme & preſerue vs eternally in the moſt bleſſed ſtate of glory. For neither ſhall hee Prophecy any more vnto vs by the miniſtry of the Goſpell, nor propitiate for vs by the ſacrifice of his death and Paſſion, nor gouerne vs by the ſcepter of his word as here hee doth: but in this reſpect ſhall hee *deliuer vp the Kingdome vnto his Father*, and the Godhead in the holy Trinity ſhall without all meanes bee immediately vnto vs all in all.

1 Cor. 15.24.

N. B.

Reſt therefore in Chriſt is the Effect of Faith, and Faith is the cauſe of Reſt: and ſo conſequently Faith is not Reſt, nor Reſt is not Faith.

I. D.

If, ſay you, Faith bee the cauſe of Reſt, and Reſt bee the Effect of Faith, then is not Faith Reſt nor Reſt Faith. This I yeeld you. But Faith is the cauſe of Reſt and Reſt is the effect of Faith. How proue you this? It ſeemeth by the illatiue particle: Therefore that you referre vs for this vnto ſome former premiſſes. What then haue you formerly ſaid? That *a full aſſurance as a cauſe worketh reſt vpon Chriſt as an effect*. But neither is Aſſurance Faith, and I haue ſufficiently proued that Aſſurance is not the cauſe of Reſt, nor Reſt an effect of Aſſurance. Againe,

you

you ſay that *Faith worketh eternall reſt and peace.* But how doth this follow, Faith is the cauſe of eternall quiet and reſting from our labours in the Kingdome of Heauen, *Ergo*, it is the cauſe of Affiance and Reſting vpon Chriſt here in this life? for it is not neceſſary that that which cauſeth the one, ſhould alſo cauſe the other. But if in your Concluſion when you ſay Faith is not a Reſt, you meane it is not that eternall reſt, what is that to mee who define not Faith by ſuch a Reſt? So then your therefore either concluding beſide the Queſtion, or being inferred vpon no Premiſſes, deſerueth of mee no anſwer at all. Yet to take away all ſcruple, let vs ſee what may be ſaid for it.

Bellarmine to proue that Affiance is an Effect of Faith, and conſequently not Faith, alledgeth and vrgeth three paſſages of Scripture: but withall I muſt tell you, that if hee diſpute to the purpoſe, hee muſt meane by Affiance, no other then confident Perſwaſion or Aſſurance. For his aduerſaries, as himſelfe there ſaith, defining Faith by Affiance, vnderſtand thereby that Speciall Faith, whereby euery one applying to himſelfe the diuine Promiſe, belieueth or rather confidently truſteth that all his ſins are forgiuen him by Chriſt. So that if (as he ought) hee argue vnto the meaning of his aduerſaries, hee concludeth not againſt my Affiance, but onely againſt your Perſwaſion or Aſſurance. Neuertheleſſe let vs examine thoſe places ſeuerally and particularly. The firſt is that of the Apoſtle to the Epheſians, *In whom wee haue boldneſſe and entrance with confidence by the Faith of him*: whence it followeth, ſaith hee, if confidence or Affiance be by Faith, that Faith is not Affiance but the cauſe thereof: for otherwiſe the ſenſe would bee, we haue en-

De iuſtif. lib. 1. cap. 6.

Eph. 3. 12.

trance with confidence by confidence, which is absurd. To this I answer, first that πεποίθησις or Confidence oftentimes signifieth Perswasion or Assurance, being deriued of a verbe that signifieth firmely to be Perswaded, as where the Apostle saith, πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, Rom. 2. 19. *thou strongly perswadest thy selfe that thou art a guide of the blind*; and againe, τοῦτο πεποιθὼς οἶδα, Phil. 1. 25. *this am I well assured of*: and therefore it is not necessary here to vnderstand it of my Affiance. Secondly, grant that by πεποίθησις this Affiance is meant, yet doth it not follow that it is an effect of Iustifying Faith, seeing by faith not Iustifying but Historicall Faith may bee vnderstood, which is the meanes by which wee grow vnto Affiance. Lastly, let it be farther yeelded, that both, by πεποίθησις Affiance, and by πίστις iustifying Faith are meant; yet may Affiance this notwithstanding bee that Faith, neither will any such absurdity ensue thereon. For as when you say, wee are assured by Faith you would thinke your selfe wronged if I should inferre thereupon that Faith is not Assurance but the cause thereof, or that otherwise the sense would bee wee are assured by assurance: so when the Apostle saith in Affiance by Faith, why should he not also count himselfe as much abused if you gather from hence that Faith is not Affiance but the cause thereof, or that else the speech would be absurd, as if hee should say in Affiance by Affiance. The reason of all in a word is, because this forme of words may import that Affiance is the next and immediate Act of Iustifying Faith. The second place is that saying of our Sauiour vnto the woman diseased with an issue of blood, Mat. 9. 22. *Bee confident daughter, thy Faith hath saued thee*: where saith hee, Faith is againe in like sort distinguished from Affiance; for the woman

is

is moued to conceiue and entertaine Affiance who was already healed by Faith. To this I anſwer, that the word which our Sauiour vſeth to the woman is θάρσει which ſignifieth to be bold or couragious, whence commeth θάρσος Boldnes, courage, which as *Iulius Scaliger* ſaith, is the motion of Fortitude vnto ſome worke, and is oppoſed vnto Timerouſneſſe or Fearefulneſſe. Neither was it without ſpeciall reaſon that our Sauiour choſe that word rather then any other: for finding that vertue proceeded from him, and demanding who had touched him, the woman ſeeing that ſhee could conceale it came vnto him trembling, and fell at his feet, and declared what ſhee had done, whereupon hee ſaid vnto her, θάρσει θυγάτηρ. *Tremble not Daughter, nor be diſmay'd, but cheere vp and bee of good courage, for I aſſure thee thy Faith hath ſaued thee, goe thy way in Peace.* Now this Boldneſſe or courage I confeſſe is an effect of Faith, nay oftentimes an effect of the effect of Faith, namely Hope: for as Deſpaire of victory cauſeth Fearefulneſſe and deiection of Spirit, ſo contrariwiſe Hope of victory maketh a man to bee bold and confident. But vnleſſe you can proue that this Boldneſſe is the ſame with my Affiance (which with all your skill you can neuer doe, they being of ſo different natures) you can neuer conclude from hence that Affiance is an effect of Faith. The third and laſt place is that of the ſame Apoſtle vnto Timothy, *They which miniſter well ſhall get vnto themſelues a good degree and much affiance in the Faith which is in Chriſt*: where, ſaith hee, Affiance is ſaid to be acquired and gotten by Faith, becauſe Faith may bee without ſuch Affiance. Whereunto I anſwer that the word vſed in the originall is παῤῥησία, which no way ſignifieth Affi-

Exerc. 317. 4.

Luc. 8. 47.

1 Tim. 3. 13.

ance, but libertie and freedome of ſpeech, whether wee vtter our mind vnto God by prayer, as where the Apoſtle ſaith, *Let vs come* μετὰ παῤῥησίας *with boldneſſe and freedome of Speech vnto the Throne of grace*, or make profeſſion of our Faith before men, as where the ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *Caſt not away* τὴν παῤῥησίαν ὑμῶν *your free profeſſion*, as *Beza* tranſlateth it: And becauſe this libertie and freedome proceedeth from the teſtimony of a good conſcience, and aſſurance of the loue and fauour of God: therefore is it ſometimes vſed for Aſſurance, as where the Apoſtle ſaith, *Whoſe houſe wee are if wee hold faſt* τὴν παῤῥησίαν *that confidence and reioycing of Hope vnto the end*, meaning by Confidence faith *Beza* that moſt worthy effect of Faith whereby wee crye Abba Father: and ſometimes for that Lion-like boldneſſe which *Salomon* ſaith, alwayes attendeth a good conſcience, and ſo doth the ſame *Beza* in this preſent place of *Timothy* vnderſtand it. And hence it is that the Syriacke oftentimes rendreth this word by Retection or Reuelation of the face, becauſe a good conſcience lifteth vp the head, and boldly ſheweth the face: whereas a guiltie minde hangeth downe the head, and (as one confounded and aſhamed) dares not looke either God or man in the face. So then ſeeing this is the right ſenſe and meaning of this word in this place, and it is in no place found to ſignifie my Affiance: you cannot with any probability hence conclude that ſuch Affiance is the Effect of Faith, and not Faith. Vnto theſe three paſſages thus vouched by *Bellarmine*, you may if you pleaſe adde ſundry others of the like nature, as namely thoſe which attribute vnto Faith, *Subſiſtence of things hoped for, euidence of things not ſeene, Plerophorie or fulneſſe of Aſſurance*,

Heb. 4. 16.
Heb. 10. 35.
Heb. 3. 6.
Prou. 28. 1.
Heb. 3. 6. vide annot. Tremel. ad Heb. 4. 16.
Heb. 11. 1. Col. 2. 2. & Ro. 4. 21. Rom. 5. 1. Ro. 14. 17.

§. 2.

rance, Peace with God, Ioy in the Holy Ghoſt, Spirituall glorying and boaſting, obſignation by the Spirit, and finally, *Tranquillity and quietneſſe of the ſoule*: all which I cannot but acknowledge to bee the fruits and effects of iuſtifying Faith. But yet I deny that either they all, or any of them haue the ſame definition with that Affiance which I haue made to bee the proper Act of that Faith. And therefore to end this diſcourſe, whereunto not the force of your Concluſion (which being barely affirmed might as eaſily haue beene reiected) but onely the ſincere deſire I haue to leaue nothing vnſatisfied, drew me: I ſtill pronounce that for any thing hitherto hath beene ſaid, Iuſtifying Faith is an Affiance. Eph. 1. 13. Mat. 11. 29.

Yet before I proceed any farther, I muſt bee ſo bold as to plucke you by the eare, and to call to your remembrance what erewhile you ſaid, namely that *a man may reſt his will vpon Chriſt and his merits and yet bee damned.* Which how it may agree with that which here you ſay that *Reſt on Chriſt is an effect of iuſtifying Faith*, I cannot (ſuch is my blindneſſe) ſee. For it ſeemeth that where the effects of Iuſtifying Faith are, there iuſtifying Faith alſo is: whereupon it followeth that, either this Reſting on Chriſt cannot be in thoſe that are to be damned, becauſe they want Iuſtifying Faith to worke this effect in them, or that a man may bee damned hauing Iuſtifying Faith together with the effects thereof in him which by your owne confeſſion is abſurd, or laſtly that this Reſting vpon Chriſt is not a fruit or effect of Iuſtifying Faith which is diametrally oppoſite vnto your Concluſion. I beſeech you Sir, let vs at your leaſure heare from you how either theſe ſtrange Paradoxes may be verified, or theſe ſeeming contradictions reconciled.

N. B.

Beſides this word Reſt is ambiguous, and may bee taken in ill part, and may bee in many negligent and careleſſe Chriſtians which euery day and for euery ſinne bring Chriſt to the Croſſe, and ſay wee will reſt vpon Chriſt, and in the meane time worke nothing worthy of the Name of a Chriſtian, but rather wallow in all kind of filthineſſe. And in this ſenſe onely doe I ſay a man may bee damned with ſuch a Reſt vpon Chriſt. I ſpeake this to preuent your captious cauils. It is fit for you therefore that take vpon you to ſee more then euer any learned man ſaw before your time to bewaile of all equiuotations and words doubtfull.

I. D.

That the word Reſt is ambiguous I ſaw well inough, and therefore in my Treatiſe carefully diſtinguiſhed the equiuocation thereof, where if you marked it not, you muſt blame your owne ouerſight and not my Vnvarineſſe. For two kinds of *Reſting vpon Chriſt*, I ſaid there were, the one *Sleight* and *Superficiall*, the other *Setled and well grounded*, and this *Setled and grounded Affiance* I made to bee the *Act of Iuſtifying Faith*, as there you may read more at large. Now you, to preuent captious cauils, tell me, that when you ſay, *a man may bee damned notwithſtanding his Reſting vpon Chriſt*, you vnderſtand it of that which *may bee in many negligent and careleſſe Chriſtians*, that is to ſay of *Sleight and ſuperficiall Affiance onely*. Wherein you ſhew your ſelfe too too both ridiculous and idle: ridiculous in ſaying, *you ſpeake this*

this to preuent my captious cauils, whereas indeed this very captious cauill of yours was in my Treatiſe as appeareth ſo manifeſtly preuented by mee: Idle, in arguing from *ſleight and ſuperficiall Affiance* vnto that which is *Setled and Grounded* on this manner (for ſo in effect you confeſſe,) *Sleight Affiance may bee in the Damned*, Ergo, *ſetled Affiance is not Iuſtifying Faith*, as if you ſhould ſay, *An aſſe may haue a ſhadow*, Ergo, *the Body of a man is not a ſolid ſubſtance*. And thus, to requite you with your owne Prouerbe, you periſh like the rat by bewraying your ſelfe: for hauing vrged this argument now twice againſt mee, and that with ſuch confidence as if it alone were ſufficient to batter downe the bulwarke of my Definition, at length you tell vs very grauely and ſadly, that it is but paper ſhot which hitherto you haue diſcharged, and that all the breaches you haue made may eaſily bee repaired by diſtinguiſhing an equiuocation.

Where you ſay *I take vpon mee to ſee more then euer any learned man ſaw before my time*, it hath beene already ſufficiently anſwered both in my Treatiſe & in this Defence thereof. Neuertheleſſe becauſe you harpe ſo often vpon this ſtring, this I adde, that (vnleſſe you can demonſtrate that it is impoſſible for a man of meane parts and gifts to ſee and obſerue that which men of greater learning and deeper vnderſtanding haue not obſerued) I know no reaſon why a man may not without taxation of modeſty take vpon him in ſome things to ſee that which others haue not ſeene before him. It is true that a Giant by reaſon of his tallneſſe muſt needs ſee farther then a dwarfe or one that is but of a meane ſtature: yet if you place a dwarfe aloft vpon the ſhoulders of a giant, he

hee ſhall then bee able to ſee farther then the Giant himſelfe can. I am I confeſſe, not vnto your ſeeming onely, but in very deed a dwarfe as it were in Diuinity, euen the leaſt and meaneſt of ten thouſand; and thoſe our Predeceſſors hauing beene ſo eminently and incomparably qualified with all kind of graces and endowments, are as it were Giants in compatiſon of vs. And therefore it would bee intolerable both pride to thinke and impudence to ſay that of my ſelfe I could ſee as farre into the myſteries of Religion as they could. But now being aduanced as it were vpon their ſhoulders, and hauing the benefit of all thoſe volumes which they wrote, and in them of all whatſoeuer they knew: why ſhould it ſeeme ſtrange that ſomething comes within the compaſſe of my ken which they though eagle-ſighted perceiued not? And yet by your fauour, Sir, *I take no ſuch matter vpon mee*, or if I ſeeme to doe ſo, I hope I doe it with all modeſtie, and it can bee no more then this that out of ſuch Premiſes as they haue taught mee, I gather a Concluſion which they attended not.

N. B.

For I tell you this, if Maſter Perkins *whom you ſay you blanked with your rare cunning diſputer were deſirous to ſift this Genus or word Reſt, you ſhall hardly perſwade mee that hee will take it for any other then the effect of true Iuſtifying Faith.*

I. D.

Neither is it your vaine ſurmiſing what *Maſter Perkins* would ſay; Neither his expreſſe and direct ſaying, that

that may be the decider of this controuersie. How well that worthy man deserued of the Church of God, wherein hee was like another Baptist both a *shining and a burning torch*, I cannot bee ignorant who knew him so well: and very vngratefull were I, if I should not acknowledge to haue receiued a good part of that little skill I haue in my profession from his mouth hauing beene for sundry yeeres his ordinary auditor. Yet because hee was not a *Peter*, or a *Paul*, nor so preserued from error by the Spirit of truth, that hee could mistake in nothing; I hope I may, without arrogance, and with reseruation of due reuerence & honor vnto his worth in some points dissent from him. And if you may seat Faith both in the vnderstanding and the will, notwithstanding that *M. Perkins* place it only in the vnderstanding, affirming that it scarce standeth with reason that one single grace should inhere in two distinct faculties: why may not I take the same liberty vnto my selfe, and define Iustifying Faith by Affiance, although *M. Perkins* would take it for no other then the Effect of Iustifying Faith? for so indeed hee doth, and I deny not, but freely confesse, that vpon the reasons aboue rendred, I doe in this point altogether differ from him. Neither yet did I say, *that I blanked him with my rare and cunning disputes*, for this is but the renewing of your old slander, the vanity of which I haue already detected. Onely it seemes that your best wine is well nie spent, seeing now you serue your guests with these dregs: and that you are driuen to a very narrow strait, when you are faine to arme against me such base calumniations and fictions of your owne braine.

Ioh. 5. 35.

On the Creed.

N. B.

When you send me to Master Foxe *in his Booke* de Christo gratis iustificante, *without citing the place where, or the words what, of mee your speech deserueth none answer: but this I dare vndertake, you abuse the writings of so reuerend a man.*

D. I.

The authority of *Master Foxe* was not vouched by me, to iustify my Definition, that Faith is Affiance, but to ouerthrow yours, who affirme that Faith is Assurance: and therefore was placed as was fitting, after those arguments which I vrged against you. Neuertheless here it pleaseth you after your desultory and disorderly manner of disputing in a very vndue place to giue answer vnto it. And the reason why with such violence you haue vrged it (as I guesse) is this, that not appearing where it should it may seeme to giue no euidence at all against your Assurance, and being ordered where it should not it may seeme to bee but idly alledged as being of no force to maintaine my Affiance. But yet let vs see what exceptions you take to eleuate this authority.

Because I *cite not the place where, nor the words what, my speech, you say, deserues no answer.* I wisse, *M. Baxter*, that booke is not of such bulke but that perusing the titles of each Chapter you might soone haue found out the places by me intended: and you know that the schedule I sent you, being endited at *Bristoll*, where I was farre from my bookes, I could not possibly referre you

you vnto the very page and line, as otherwiſe I would haue done. But now becauſe I haue the booke at hand, I will ſet you downe his direct words, and quote you the page where you may read them, and then leaue you to bee iudge your ſelfe, whether as you charge mee I abuſe the writings of that reuerend man, or hee agree with mee in this, that Faith is not Aſſurance. *Maſter Foxe* therefore in his booke *de Chriſto gratis iuſtificante, pag.* 246. ſaith thus, *My iudgement and opinion is that this confidence of mercy, and certainty of Saluation promiſed is a thing which ought to bee very neerely conioined with Faith, and which euery one ought neceſſarily to apply vnto himſelfe: yet being moſt applied is not that which onely by it ſelfe properly and abſolutely diſchargeth vs of our ſinnes, and iuſtifies before God, but that there is ſome other thing propounded in the Goſpell, which in nature goeth before this certainty, and iuſtifieth before God. For Faith vpon the Perſon of the Sonne of God, whereby wee are firſt reconciled vnto God neceſſarily goes before.* Againe pag. 253. *Although*, ſaith hee, *certainty and aſſurance of diuine grace (which it ſelfe is ſometime commended vnder the name of Faith) bee very neerely ioined with Faith, yet this aſſurance doth not properly import the cauſe of iuſtifying, but receiueth it being brought, neither worketh iuſtification, but is rather wrought by it, and maketh them certaine, who by the Faith of Chriſt are iuſtified, but it ſelfe iuſtifieth not.* And yet againe pag. 255. *If the queſtion bee of the cauſe which properly iuſtifieth from ſinne, I anſwer it is that Faith not whereby wee beliue, that wee are iuſtified, but whereby wee beliue in Chriſt the Sonne of God.* Thus *M. Foxe*, and thus by *M. Foxe*, it appeareth as I affirmed, that in this point I am not ſingular and alone. Foxe.

Yet to preuent captious cauils, you may bee pleased to vnderstand that the Latin word vsed by *Master Foxe*, to wit *Fiducia*, I haue in my translation englished Confidence and Assurance; not that I was afraid lest rendring it Affiance, hee might seeme to exclude my affiance also from the Definition of Faith, for had hee done so, it were nothing to mee, hauing shewed that hee denies Faith to be Assurance, which was all I there affirmed of him: but because, if you marke his words attentiuely, you shall find that by *Fiducia*, hee vnderstands not Affiance, but confidence Perswasion or Assurance, for hee doth euer confound it with Certainty, and expresly defines it to bee that whereby wee are assured of our iustification by Christ. So doth *Melancthon* also, and *Kemnitius*, and many others, vnderstanding by *Fiducia*, a firme Perswasion that our sinnes are certainly remitted by the propitiation of Christ, and all the benefits of the promise of grace giuen, communicated, and applyed vnto vs. So that vnlesse I would haue depraued my authors meaning, I could not translate otherwise then I haue done.

N. B.

Now thinke not that I hold, that a man ordinarily saued may be saued without relying vpon Christ Iesus: for I hold the cleane contrary, viz. *that true Iustifying Faith assuring a man in spirituall knowledge of his owne saluation in Iesus Christ, worketh and causeth a sweet rest and repasing of the whole soule vpon Christ and his Merits. But I deny that this Rest is Faith, or this Faith Rest, no more then the tree can be the fruite, or the fruite the tree.*

I. D.

I. D.

That no man can ordinarily bee ſaued without Relying vpon Chriſt I grant, for according to my definition, this Relying vpon Chriſt, is Iuſtifying Faith: but that this Reſting vpon Chriſt, is vnto Faith, as the fruite is to the tree, proue it ſufficiently, and in Gods Name take the victory. But you muſt not thinke, that affirming is proouing, or facing arguing: and very meanely doe you conceiue of your Readers iudgement, if you thinke, that your weake aſſeuerations can more preuaile with them then the ſtrength of my reaſons. For if by Reſt you vnderſtand, as you ſhould, not Quiet and peace of Conſcience which I confeſſe is not complete with our Aſſurance, but that Affiance by which wee ſtay our ſelues vpon Chriſt, accepting him to bee our Mediator in ſuch ſort as is aboue deſcribed: I haue both plainely and ſoundly demonſtrated, that Faith is ſuch a Reſt, and ſuch a Reſt Faith, and not the fruite of Faith.

N. B.

And to be plaine with you, when you ſay Iuſtifying Faith is not a Knowledge or an Aſſurance, you ſpeake pure Bellarmine, *as appeareth in his Booke* de iuſtificatione. *I pray you therefore though you miſlike* M. Perkins, *turne not pure Papiſt.* Tom. 3. de Iuſtif. ca. 7.

I. D.

And to bee plaine with you alſo, if your kind of reaſoning may paſſe for currant, when you ſay, Iuſtifying

Faith is not a Reſt or Affiance, you ſpeake pure *Bellarmine*: for in the ſame Booke by you quoted, as hee denieth Faith to bee Aſſurance, ſo hee denieth it alſo to be Affiance. I pray you therefore though you miſlike my Definition yet turne not pure Papiſt. But, *Maſter Baxter*, you miſtake the matter very much if you thinke all is Popiſh or erronious whatſoeuer either a member of the Church of Rome, or the whole Church of Rome holdeth: for by this rule wee ſhould with the Arrians of Poleland, renounce the very Faith of the Trinity as a branch of Antichriſts Religion, of whom it is reported, that therefore and for this reaſon, ſpecially they hold the Pope to bee the miſticall beaſt ſpoken of in the Reuelation, and his triple Crowne a viſible marke thereof, becauſe hee maintaineth the doctrine of the Trinity. As therefore erewhile you ſaid vnto mee, *Let vs not be bound to defend the errors of our Brethren*, ſo ſay I now vnto you, *Let vs not bee bound to reiect the truths of our aduerſaries*. For truth is Gods whereſoeuer it bee found, though it were in the mouth of him who is the father of lies: and if *Ticonius* the Donatiſt ſpeake with better reaſon then *Cyprian* an orthodox father, *S. Auguſtin* will not ſticke therein, to preferre the Hereticke before him that is Catholike. But notwithſtanding all this, I would haue you to know, that all the agreement betweene mee and *Bellarmine* is onely in this what Faith is not: for in queſtion what it is we differ the whole heauen one from another, he defining it by Aſſent vnto diuine truths, I by Affiance on the perſon of Chriſt.

Cap. 5. 6. 9.

Retract. lib. 2. ca. 18.

N. B.

N. B.

Now, Maſter Downe, *to make an end, and returne to my other affaires from whence you haue vnkindly drawne mee, I pray you read a few Poſitions to the which oppoſe what you can.*

I. D.

What your affaires are I am not well acquainted withall: but what they ſhould bee I wot full well. Among the reſt maintenance of Gods truth, and conuincing of contrary errors are both by the rule of Chriſtianity in generall, and the office of the Miniſtry which you haue taken vpon you in particular required of you. Wherein if you bee ſure, that all this while you haue beene employed, you diſcredit your action exceedingly when you ſay you are *vnkindly drawne from your other affaires vnto it.* Remember you not what the woman replied vnto *Philip* of Macedon denying to heare her ſute, becauſe he was not at leiſure? Haſt thou not, quoth ſhee, leiſure to bee a King? So ſay I vnto you, either doe the worke if you will bee a Miniſter of Chriſts Goſpell, or elſe bee no Miniſter if you bee vnwilling to doe the worke. Plut. Apophth.

To what end you ſhould offer vnto me theſe Poſitions following, requiring mee to oppoſe what I can againſt them, I cannot well coniecture: for what ſtuffe haue you here brought vs beſides that which either is already ſufficiently anſwered, or whereof there is no queſtion at all betwixt vs? And therefore I ſee no cauſe why I ſhould vouchſafe to beſtow any time or labour about them.

Neuer-

Neuertheles to ſatisfy your requeſt a word or two touching them.

N. B:

True Iuſtifying Faith defined.

1. *Iuſtifying Faith, is an aſſured knowledge, or knowing aſſurance, by the which euery one of the elected relieth vpon the Promiſes of the mercy of God in Chriſt Ieſus, firmely holding that Chriſt and eternall life together with all the merits of Chriſt, are giuen to him to righteouſneſſe and eternall ſaluation.*

Fides vnica & indiuidua ſpecie.

2. *There is but one onely ſpeciall iuſtifying Faith.*

3. *This Faith differeth in number and degree.*

Hæc Fides differt numero & gradu.

4. *It is manifeſt there bee ſo many ſeuerall Faiths in number, as there bee ſeuerall perſons elected.*

5. *One man is not ſaued by another mans Faith.*

Mat. 26. 74. 75. & 17. 17. Mar. 9. 24.

6. *This Faith differeth in degrees, ſmall in one man, and mighty in another,* Mat. 13. 23. & 14. 31. Act. 2. 8. ca. 4. Mat. 15. 28.

Fides imperfecta;

7. *The greateſt Faith in this life is imperfect.* 1 Cor. 13. 9. & 12.

Ad reſiſtendum timen diabolo ſufficiens & quare.

8. *Though it bee ſmall and infirme, yet it is ſufficient to reſiſt the Diuell, by reaſon of the prayers and promiſes of Chriſt.*

2 Cor. 5. 1. Eſa. 53. 11.

9. *This Knowledge or Faith (for they bee conuertible* Ioh. 17. 3.*) paſſeth all vnderſtanding* Eph. 3. 14. &c.

Cauſa efficiens material.

10. *The Efficient cauſe of this Faith, is the Spirit of God.*

11. *The inſtrumentall ordinary cauſe, is the preaching ſincerely of the Word of God.*

12. *God may worke extraordinarily Faith in the Elect without preaching by his Spirit.*

Obiectum Fidei in genere & ſpecie.

13. *The obiect of Faith in generality is the whole*

Word

Word of God, in ſpeciality the promiſes of God in Chriſt and his Merits.

14. *The formall cauſe is a confident relation to all the Word of God, and certainty of ſaluation.* Formalis.

15. *The finall cauſe ſubordinate, is the ſaluation of the Elect, the chiefeſt end is the celebration of the mercy and iuſtice of God.* Finis ſubordinatus, ſummus.

16. *The effects are concerning God, our ſelues, our neighbour: God, in truly ſeruing him; our ſelues, in wholy reſting vpon him; our neighbour, in truly louing him.* Effecta.

17. *The ſubiect where Faith reſteth is the heart, the vnderſtanding, and the will of man.* Subiectum in quo reſidet Fides.

18. *The properties are two, firſt, that Faith bee aliue and not dead; ſecondly, that it bee perpetuall.* Adiuncta duo.

I. D.

The firſt, the thirteenth, and the foureteenth, I wholly and abſolutely deny, hauing fully proued, againſt the firſt, that Faith is not a Knowledge or Aſſurance; againſt the thirteenth, that the onely proper Obiect of Faith is the Perſon of the Mediator, and againſt the foureteenth, that the Forme thereof is Affiance and not any ſuch Relation or Certainty. The ninth, ſixteenth, and ſeuenteenth in part I deny: the ninth, where you make Faith and Knowledge to bee conuertible which I haue proued to haue different natures and Definitions; the ſixteenth where you affirme Reſting vpon Chriſt to bee an effect of Faith, which I haue demonſtrated to bee the Forme and proper Act of Faith; the ſeuenteenth, where you ſay that the ſubiect of Faith is both the Vnderſtanding and the Will, againſt which I haue ſhewed, that it is impoſ-

ſible for one and the ſame Habit to be ſubiectiuely in two ſeuerall faculties of the Soule. The reſt of your Poſitions (ſauing the inconuenience of ſome tearmes, and ſetting a fauourable conſtruction vpon them) I acknowledge to bee true; and becauſe, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, I can doe nothing againſt the truth, but for the truth, therefore I oppoſe them not, but readily and willingly yeeld and ſubſcribe vnto them.

But, *Maſter Baxter*, in all this long diſcourſe of Faith, hauing ſpoken ſo carefully of the Definition of Faith, of the vnity of it in kind, and difference of it in number and degree, of the imperfection, ſufficiencie, efficient, principall and inſtrumentall, of the obiect both in generall and ſpeciall, of the forme, and end both Subordinate and Higheſt, finally of the Effects, Subiects, and adiuncts thereof: in all this long diſcourſe, I ſay, how is it that wee heare not ſo much as a word of Iuſtification, which notwithſtanding is the immediate and proper Effect of Faith? Immediate, becauſe it is the firſt fruite and benefit that ſpringeth of it, and commeth before Adoption and Sanctification: proper, becauſe it is the Act of Faith onely, and not of any other Grace which iuſtifies a man before God. Whether it were of negligence, or of policy, that you haue omitted ſo materiall and neceſſary a point, I cannot ſay. If of negligence, it deſerues a ſeuere chaſtiſement: if of policy, it was I think you foreſaw what a dangerous conſequence would follow thereupon. For if you had placed Iuſtification (as needs you muſt haue done if you had mentioned it) among the Effects of Faith, the Reader poſſibly might haue reaſoned thus, If iuſtification be an Effect of Faith and ſo follow after Faith, then cannot Aſſurance of Iuſtification

ſtification bee Faith, becauſe it is an effect of Iuſtification and followes after: for it is neceſſary that a man bee iuſtified, before hee can bee aſſured that hee is iuſtified. And thus you had caſt away your whole pot of broth, if you had not warily kept this *Coloquintida* out of it. But vpon what ground ſoeuer you haue forborne to ſpeake of this point, I will by your leaue ſupply this defect, and in a word or two ſhew you in what ſenſe I affirme that Affiance iuſtifies, and deny it of Aſſurance: for in ſome ſort Aſſurance alſo may bee ſaid to iuſtifie. 2 King. 4. 39.

Iuſtification is a law-tearme, and is oppoſed vnto Condemnation. As therefore Condemnation is the ſentence of a iudge pronouncing a man to be guilty, and deliuering him ouer to bee puniſhed: ſo is Iuſtification alſo the ſentence of a iudge, but abſoluing and acquitting a man both from crime and puniſhment. Now there are three barres at which all men are arraigned, and three Iudges; who at their ſeuerall barres either iuſtify vs, or condemne vs, that is to ſay, the barre of God, the barre of Conſcience, and the barre of Men. If wee bee condemned at all theſe barres, and by all theſe Iudges, wee are of all creatures the moſt miſerable: if wee bee abſolued at them all, and by them all, of all men wee be the moſt bleſſed. Againe, if Men acquit vs, what booteth it, if our owne Conſcience condemne vs? and if our Conſcience acquit vs, what auaileth it, if God condemne vs? for who can deliuer the prey out of the pawes of that Lion? On the contrary ſide, if men condemne vs, it mattereth not, ſo as our Conſcience doe abſolue vs: and if our Conſcience alſo doe condemne vs, yet happy are we, if God abſolue vs, for God is greater then our Conſcience. What that is, for which ſentence of 1 Ioh. 3. 20.

Condemnation paſſeth vpon vs at any of theſe bars, there is no queſtion, for it is well knowne to bee ſinne: ſinne I ſay which is ſo indeed, or at leaſt is ſo in appearance. For although nothing appeare vnto God otherwiſe then it is, ſo that there can bee no error in his iudgement: yet our owne conſciences and other men may eaſily bee deceiued and miſtaken, and ſo without cauſe oftentimes pronounce ſentence of Condemnation. What then is that by which wee are iuſtifyed and abſolued from our ſins, and the puniſhment of death due vnto them? Surely, that which is contrary vnto ſinne, euen Righteouſneſſe.

Phil. 3. 9. What Righteouſneſſe? for, as the Apoſtle diſtinguiſheth, there is a Righteouſneſſe which is of the law, and there is a righteouſneſſe which is of Faith: by the former, ſhall no fleſh liuing bee iuſtified, by the latter euery one that Belieueth is iuſtified. God iuſtifieth vs at his barre when hee ſeeth our Faith, that by firme Affiance wee reſt and rely our ſelues vpon Chriſt to bee our Mediator, accepting him to bee our Prophet, Prieſt, and King: for then according vnto promiſe doth hee accept the Paſſiue obedience of Chriſt to ſatisfy for our ſinnes paſt, and imputeth vnto vs his Actiue obedience to ſupply the want of that perfect legall righteouſneſſe which ſhould be in vs. Our Conſcience iuſtifies vs at his barre, when it is perſwaded that God hath already iuſtified vs: for as long as it is perſwaded that God condemneth, it cannot acquit vs. If the perſwaſion of the Conſcience be built vpon a ſandy and deceitfull foundation, it is rather vaine preſumption then true aſſurance, and the iudgement that it giueth is erronious: but if it bee grounded vpon infallible euidence, euen the teſtimony of the Spirit of God, witneſſing with our ſpirits that wee are the

Rom. 8. 16. ſons.

ſons of God, then is the Aſſurance ſound and certaine, and the ſentence pronounced thereupon iuſt and right-full, whence preſently ariſeth in our ſoules ſuch vnconceiuable peace as paſſeth all vnderſtanding, and ſuch durable ioy as nothing can take from vs. Finally, Men iuſtify vs at their barre alſo, when our light ſo ſhineth before them, that they ſee our good works, which are the fruits of Faith and a good Conſcience, and thereby are moued to glorify our Heauenly Father: as being perſwaded in the iudgement of Charity that they are indeed as they ſeeme to bee, euen iuſtified before God, and borne againe of water and the Holy Ghoſt. This iudgement becauſe it is built vpon probability onely, and not vpon certainty (for who knowes whether the outward appearance come from the inward holyneſſe or hollowneſſe of the heart, but onely the heart it ſelfe, and God which made it?) May therefore bee erronious, and though proceeding from Charity, yet in the meane ſeaſon ſwaruing from verity. If then when Men iuſtify vs, our owne Conſciences tell vs, that they pronounce a wrong ſentence, and abſolue the guilty: the comfort that growes vnto vs thereby is no better then a cup of cold water is vnto a man ſicke of a burning feuer, or then the *Sardonian* laughter which makes the face ſeeme to grin, while the deadly poiſon is ſearching through euery veine, and ſeazing vpon the very heart. But if wee bee well aſſured that the ſentence is iuſt and true, and that they are not deceiued therein, although it bee not the end wee aymed at, nor the Crowne wee looked for, yet is it a ſweet and amiable companion of holy life, publickely teſtifying vnto our great comfort that God hath been glorified by vs, our profeſſion honoured, and

Phil. 4. 7.

Ioh. 16. 22.

Mat. 5. 16.

others inuited if not gained vnto Chriſt. And thus much haue I thought good in regard of your ſilence to ſpeake I hope not impertinently, at leaſt wiſe not vnprofitably of Iuſtification: the ſumme whereof is that Affiance iuſtifies before God, Aſſurance before Conſcience, works before Men. So that I doe not ſimply deny either that Aſſurance is Faith (for in my Treatiſe I acknowledge that the Scripture ſometime calleth it Faith) or that it iuſtifieth (for I confeſſe it iuſtifieth at the barre of Conſcience) onely I deny it to bee that Faith which iuſtifies before God, affirming that Faith to bee no other then Affiance.

N. B.

Thus, Maſter Downe, *you haue, what you haue ſo much, ſo earneſtly, ſo bitterly, and contumeliouſly wreſted from mee in writing, ſith that you haue refuſed to defend your Doctrine preached here by Diſputation.*

I. D.

Indeed, *Maſter Baxter*, when I vnderſtood by the aduertiſements of ſundry my good friends in *Briſtoll*, that you had not onely drawne vp an Anſwer againſt me full of reprochfull and diſgracefull ſpeeches, but had alſo diſperſed it abroad into the hands of diuers Burgeſſes of that City, thereby to diſcredit both mee, and the Doctrine which I preached among them, without vouchſafing after a whole twelue months ſpace to ſend mee a copie thereof according vnto promiſe: true it is that as ſoone as the next oportunity was affoarded mee, I could not forbeare to chalenge you for this vnchriſtian and vnſcholler-

vnſchollerly dealing, and to let you know the iuſt indignation and diſdaine I conceiued thereat. Beſides that once, did I neuer either by word or writing ſollicit you in this matter: and then earneſt perhaps and vehement I might bee in expoſtulating with you, but Bitter and Contumelious I am ſure I was not, and for proofe thereof I referre mee vnto the teſtimonie of thoſe who were then preſent with vs. But whether earneſt and vehement, or Bitter and Contumelious, Anſwer from you by no meanes could I wreſt any. And that now I haue obtained a Copie thereof, thanks vnto thoſe my good friends who neuer left following vpon the ſent of the Foxe vntill they ſurprized him for me, and not vnto you who deſired and laboured nothing more then to keep it from mee. Of all men you liked not it ſhould light into my hands, and yet of all men me it moſt concerned, and vnto mee was onely promiſed. And ſo after the Parthian manner you fight flying, and as *Cæſar* ſaid of the Scythians make it more difficult to finde you then to foile you.

Well yet I refuſed, you ſay, *to defend the Doctrine I preached by diſputation.* Firſt, the courſe which formerly we had agreed and reſolued vpon was Writing: and therefore I ſaw no reaſon why I ſhould yeeld to haue the cauſe remoued from a higher vnto an inferiour Court, from Writing vnto Diſputation. For as a late learned writer ſaith, *Writings are more ſolid, peaceable, and certaine, then is preſent ſpeech: for more ſolid muſt thoſe things needs bee which are meditated then which are ſuddenly ſpoken, more peaceable then thoſe things which are done in the tumult, and while the minds of the Diſputants are with preſent vehemence inflamed; more certaine,* Dan. Chamier Ep. ad Egnat. Armand.

for

for writings remaine, and words are winged and fly away, and writings eaſily conuince the impudence of them that would corrupt them, which ſpeaking cannot ſo well doe. And although in quicke writing there bee without queſtion more aduiſedneſſe then in preſent ſpeaking, yet doth *Saint Hierome* excuſe his haſty commentary vpon *Saint Mathews* Goſpell, promiſing a more abſolute worke, that you may know, ſaith hee, *What ods there is betweene the boldneſſe of ſudden enditing, and the diligence of well-ſtudied writing.* Secondly, as the Apoſtle *Saint Paul* anſwered the Serieants that were ſent vnto him from the gouernours of Philippi, *After that they haue beaten vs openly vncondemned which are Romans, they haue caſt vs into Priſon, and now would they put vs out priuily? Nay verily, but let them come and bring vs out:* ſo ſay I vnto you, after you haue in a more publicke manner traduced and wronged mee, ſcattering through the whole City a moſt ſlanderous inuectiue and libell againſt mee, doe you thinke now by a priuate and chamber-diſputation to content mee? Nay verily, this plaiſter is too narrow for the wound, and open wrong requires open ſatisfaction. Laſtly, howſoeuer you pretend that you ſet not pen to paper vntill I had refuſed your chalenge of diſputation, the Reader may bee pleaſed to vnderſtand that it is cleane contrary. And therefore as I cannot but impute your deniall to impart vnto mee what in writing you had oppoſed againſt mee, to the diſtruſt you had either in your cauſe, or in your owne ſufficiency: ſo now, hauing ſcribled away ſo much precious time, and ſacrificed ſo much paper to *Cloacina*, that ſuddenly you apprehend a diſputation, I aſſure my ſelfe it was but a ſleight deuiſed vpon the preſent to ſhift me

Proœm. comment. in Math.

Act. 16. 37.

mee off, and to rid your ſelfe from me, whoſe reſidence you knew to bee elſewhere, and who at that time was to take vp a nights lodging with you. Or if you meant ſincerely and vnfainedly, doubleſſe it was confidence you had either in the boldneſſe of your forehead vncapable of the purple tincture of modeſty, or in the vnskilfulnes of thoſe who were like to be our Auditors & Moderators, who as I take it haue more skill in Marchandize and trafficking, then in *Demonſtration or Dialecticall Syllogiſmes*. For otherwiſe wee had beene vpon equall ground in either of the Vniuerſities, I ſuppoſe you would haue beene better aduiſed ere you had made that challenge vnto mee.

N. B.

I pray God it may worke in you a willing mind to embrace Peace and Brotherly loue, without the which wee can neuer ſee God. Briſtol. Iuly 27. 1602.

I. D.

It is impoſſible that vnto a man of vnderſtanding any benefit or profit ſhould accrew by reprehenſion, vnleſſe it may appeare vnto him by ſome euident remonſtrance that that which is reproued in him bee faulty and erronious, and that alſo hee bee guilty thereof. For they that thinke themſelues to bee in health, will hardly be drawne to take Phyſicke: and then *ſhall we better correct them that are wayward*, ſaith *Gregory*, *when thoſe things which they beliene to bee well done, wee demonſtrate to bee euill*. Whereas therefore it pleaſeth you here in the con- In Paſtore.

cluſion and cloſing vp of your Anſwer, to charge mee with a moſt Vnpeaceable and Vncharitable diſpoſition, praying *God it may worke in me a willing mind to embrace peace and brotherly loue:* you may not thinke that this can any way affect or moue mee, vnleſſe firſt you ſhew that I am guilty of this crime, and beare a mind ſo auerſe and abhorring from Peace and Charity, as you pretend, which I am ſure hitherto you neither haue done nor can doe. For though you haue carefully ſearched euery corner of my Treatiſe, and ranſackt euery letter and ſyllable thereof with as much greedineſſe as euer
Gen. 31. 33. *Laban* did *Iacobs* ſtuffe to find his Idols therein; yet haue you not found any thing ſauouring other then of Peace and Loue, or if you haue, why doe you not, as *Iacob* ſaid vnto his Vncle, *put it here before your brethren & my*
Verſ. 37. *brethren, that they may iudge betweene vs both?* You will ſay perhaps that in broaching this erronious doctrine touching the Definition of Faith, I plainely bewrayed a ſeditious ſpirit, and that I intended the interruption of Peace and diſſolution of loue. But neither is it neceſſary that whoſoeuer deliuereth an error ſhould preſently haue ſuch a ſeditious intention, for then what writer almoſt either ancient or late but is guilty of that impiety? Neither is the doctrine errronious, but ſound and good, and now plentifully proued ſo to bee by this Defence thereof againſt your Anſwer. So that this accuſation of yours, is altogether vniuſt, and grounded vpon no truth at all. Suppoſe neuertheleſſe it were iuſt, and that you had found your Idols, I meane both Falſhood and Faction in my writing: is it poſſible thinke you that ſuch an Anſwer as this is, either of it ſelfe, or ſanctified by your Prayer, may be effectuall to reclaime

mee

mee from mine errour, or to worke mee vnto a more peaceable mind? Certainly it is impoſſible. For what is it of it ſelfe other then a fardle of vanities? And what promiſe haue you in Gods word that vpon your prayer you ſhall bee able to open the eyes of the blind by dawbing them ouer with clay, or to ſtill the raging of the ſea by ſending forth more ſtormes and tempeſts vpon it? And that ſuch is your Anſwer, and ſuch the courſe you haue taken therein, although this Defence haue already made it as cleere as the noone-day: yet muſt I intreat your patience before I diſmiſſe you in a word or two, to trauerſe it ouer againe, and in a briefe Synopſis as it were to ſet before you the very ſpirit and quinteſſence thereof, that if it be poſſible you may ſee your nakedneſſe, and be aſhamed. Gen. 3. 10.

First, it is your manner like the Schollers of *Theodorus* to receiue with the left hand that which I offer with the right, that is to wreſt and peruert my plaineſt words, and to make them ſpeake not that which I intend, but what you conceiue is fitteſt for you to deſcant vpon. For example where I ſay, *I will not ſpeake of the notation, or diuerſe acceptions of the word Faith:* you turne it another way ſaying I refuſe, and accuſe, and find fault with them. Againe where I argue thus, *It is very probable, that many are ſaued without Aſſurance, becauſe our brethren of Germany hold a man cannot bee aſſured of Saluation:* you make me reaſon thus, *Whatſoeuer our brethren of Germany hold is true.* And againe where I affirme that *the Saint of God both may bee aſſured and ought to bee aſſured:* you report mee to ſay that *hee ought to haue it as of neceſſity to ſaluation.* And yet againe where I ſay *God ſhould command a reprobate to beleeue an vntruth if hee* Plutarch. περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας.

command him to beleiue that hee ſhall bee ſaued: you relate it as if I had ſayd, *God ſhould command a reprobate to belieue an vntruth if hee command him to beleiue, and hee ſhall bee ſaued.* Theſe and ſundry other ſentences in like ſort doe you miſconſter and wilfully depraue: vnleſſe perhaps your ignorance bee ſo groſſe and palpable that you could not picke the right ſenſe out of the plaineſt tearmes that poſſibly could bee vſed. But *nothing is well ſpoken*, ſaith the Poet, *which by ill relating a Sycophant may not peruert:* and if ſome bee growne to that height of impiety as to make holy writ it ſelfe a noſe of waxe, and to vary the ſence thereof, according to the alteration and change of time, I may not thinke it much, if the ſpeeches of ſo meane a one as I am be as hardly vſed, and feele the racke of ſiniſter interpretation alſo. Onely as *Diogenes* being informed that ſome derided him, they deride not mee, quoth hee: ſo ſay I, while you oppoſe your ſelfe, not vnto the meaning naturally bred in my words, but vnto a forraine ſenſe by you brought vnto them, you ſtrike not mee but your owne fancies, and like a diſtracted *Aiax* fall a murthering of poore cattell inſteed of *Vlyſſes* and his companions.

Terent. Pigh. Hierar. lib. 3. cap. 3.

Plutarch. περὶ ἀοργησίας.

Secondly, it is your guiſe vpon euery ſmall occaſion, and ſometime none at all to ſhake hands and bid farewell vnto the matter in queſtion, and to runne out into many idle and impertinent diſcourſes before you returne to it againe. Not much vnlike the fooliſh Poet in *Horace*, who profeſſing *to ſing the fortune of Priamus and the famous warre of Troy*, by and by ſpends all his art and skill in deſcribing *the grone and altar of Diana, or of ſome Cryſtall riuer haſtning about the pleaſant and delight-*

In arte Poet.

delightfull medowes. Of this ſort is that purple patch in anſwer to my firſt argument, where you ſpend a whole ſide of paper to proue that which I neuer denied, *That Faith can neither finally nor totally fall away:* and tedious collation you make vpon that of Matthew, *Sonne bee of good comfort thy ſinnes bee forgiuen thee*, a place which I neuer alledged ſo much as in my dreame: and finally, that vnneceſſary excurſion into the common place of *Election, and Reprobation, and Gods abſolute will,* which makes no more to the anſwering of my fift argument, then an axe to the opening of a locke, or a key to the cleauing of wood, as it is in the Prouerbe. Theſe extrauagances and outtopes ſeeme to mee very ſtrong preſumptions that though you could ſay but little to the purpoſe, yet your itching tongue had rather talke idly then ſay nothing. *But a wiſe man*, as *Hierome* ſaith, *before hee ſpeaketh conſidereth many things, not onely what but alſo when, and where,* and will bee ſure that it bee both true in regard of ſubſtance, and pertinent in regard of circumſtance. For *as a word oportunely ſpoken is*, as *Salomon* ſaith, *Like an aple of gold with pictures of ſiluer*; ſo a word vttered vnſeaſonably and out of due place are like Iewels and goldrings ſticking in the noſes and lips of the barbarous Indians, and rather deforming then becomming them.

Epiſt.

Prou. 25. 11.

Thirdly, it is another tricke of yours, in matters vnneceſſary and of no moment to bee as loud as *Stentor*, but in things that very much preſſe you and call for ſatisfaction, to bee as mute as one poſſeſſed with a dumbe ſpirit. For example, in anſwer to my threefold diſtinction of Faith, *I tell you*, ſay you, *iuſtifying Faith comprehends your three nice diſtinctions*: but whereas I

proue the contrary, becauſe it is impoſſible for one and the ſame habit to be ſubiectiuely in ſeuerall faculties, to this you ſay not ſo much as gry. Againe, whereas in my third argument I aſſume, *that aſſurance in nature comes after iuſtification*, you deny it: but the proofe I bring for it, *becauſe the truth of a Propoſition is in nature before the knowledge of it, and that therefore Iuſtification goes before aſſurance*, you paſſe ouer very ſlily, and ſay not one word vnto it. Furthermore, whereas I frame this obiection againſt my ſelfe, *By the knowledge of himſelfe ſhall my righteous ſeruant iuſtify many*, Ergo, *Faith is a knowledge*, and this *Affiance may bee in the wicked*, Ergo, *Faith is not Affiance*: you can bee well content to borrow them from mee, and to dart backe as it were my owne arguments againſt mee, but cloſe vp your eyes not daring to behold the anſwers wherewith I aſſoiled them, as if you had beene a tender-eyed *Leah*, and had met with an Obiect ouer-bright for you. It may be you learned this policy of *Antony*, who held it the ſafeſt and ſureſt courſe for an Oratour, when hee meeteth with a knotty peece and is vnprouided of a fit wedge for it, to paſſe it ouer with ſilence, and ſay nothing. But if, as *Cato* defineth, and *Quintilian* largely maintaineth, an *Oratour bee a good man skilfull to ſpeake in cauſes*: I aſſure you hee will much diſdaine ſuch baſe and diſhoneſt ſhifting, as no way fitting with his owne goodneſſe, or becomming the defence of a good cauſe. And howſoeuer in a continued Oration, becauſe the mind can hardly ſo diuide it ſelfe, as at once to reflect vpon what is already ſpoken, and to attend what is preſently ſaid, and bee imminent and inſtant vpon what followeth to bee ſayd, many things may ſoone bee forgotten and ſcape vnobſerued

Gen. 29. 17.

Cicl. l. 2. de orat.

Inſtit. Orator. l. 12. c. 1.

ſerued by the Anditors: yet may not the like bee hoped for in a written tract, ſpecially when it ſhall fall into the hand of an aduerſary, for hauing leaſure and time inough to peruſe it ouer againe and againe, hee will bee ſure to ſift and examine euery ſentence and ſyllable with ſuch curioſity, that ſuch palpable omiſſions as theſe cannot poſſibly paſſe vnheeded by him. But your truſt was that this writing of yours, being entruſted vnto a few of your friends onely, ſhould neuer come to bee ſo ſeuerely ſcanned by me. Otherwiſe had you had but the leaſt dramme of wit or ſhame, either you would neuer haue ſet pen to paper, knowing how vnable you were to anſwer, or you would not thus haue playd the Abce-boy, and when you met with a hard word which you could not read, thinke it enough to skip it ouer.

Fourthly, as if the old Comedy, or Cartrailing were againe reuiued and allowed, you lode mee euery foot with moſt bitter reproches and contumelious tearmes. And as cunning Cockmaſters (diſtruſting the weakneſſe of their Cocks) feed them with garlicke that yet they may annoy their aduerſaries with the ranckneſſe of their breath: ſo you ſeeing by pure ſtrength of reaſon you were very vnlikely to preuaile againſt mee, you thought yet with the ſtincking breath of ſlanderous and opprobrious ſpeeches to moleſt and trouble mee. For I pray you, are not theſe the principall flowers of your Rhetoricke? *Quirks, Elenchs, Sophiſmes, Crafty lies, ſilly Sermon, Monſters, Antipiſtos, you are no Conſtable, Inckehorne-tearmes, Itching-eares, Fanaticall ſpirits, Selfe-loue, Contention, Hypocriſie, Deſire of nouelties, Niceties, Falſities, Vnlearned, Ridiculous, Blaſphemous, Hominis acumen, your arguments ſauour mightily of Popery, your ſacke-* Xenoph. Sympos.

is

is full of ſpiders, you haue a minde to doe miſchiefe, Intolerable impudence, you incurre fearefull iudgement, you grieue Gods Spirit, captious cauils, Pure Bellarmine, Pure Papiſt, and ſix hundred other like phraſes wherewith euery page yea line almoſt is farced and ſtuffed, ſo that a man may ſooner rid *Augias* ſtable then your Anſwer of them. Certainly, the fountaine cannot be ſweet whoſe ſtreames are ſo vnſauoury, and the ſtomacke muſt needs bee full of many rotten and corrupt humours that ſendeth forth ſuch a peſtilent and noiſome breath. But it ſeemes by the date of your writing it was towards dog-dayes when you endited it, and you hoped to preuent a burning feuer or ſome ſuch dangerous ſickneſſe by diſcharging your ſtomacke of ſo much filthy choler. It had been no hard matter to haue come euen with you in the ſame kind, and to vexe you with requiting like for like: ſaue onely that I conſidered, not ſo much what you deſerue, as what beſt becomes him who pleads the cauſe of truth. For truth ſhould bee maintained with the ſpirit of truth and ſoberneſſe. *It is the nature indeed of reprochfull ſpeeches* (as *Syagrius* the Spartan ſaid) *to ſtirre & prouoke a man vnto wrath: yet ought it not ſo to preuaile vpon a wiſe man as to moue him inordinately or vndecently to reply.* Enuy may haue taught you to ſpeake euill, and a good conſcience hath taught mee to contemne euill ſpeeches: you will needs bee lord of your tongue, and I will bee as much lord of my eares. And yet if ſometimes I ſprinckle a little ſalt vpon you, or to fret away ſome of your ranke fleſh apply ſmarting coroſiues vnto you, you muſt remember, *it is the intemperance of the Patient that makes the Phyſician cruell*, and according to the old ſaying, they that raſhly ſpeake what they

Herodot. Polyhimn. &

Publ. Mim. &

they ſhould not, muſt ſometime for puniſhment heare what they would not.

Fiftly and laſtly, it is your faſhion not ſo much to care what you ſay, as how loudly you cry: hoping I thinke that as *C. Marius* ſometime ſaid, that *Lawes could not bee heard in time of warre becauſe of the clattering of armour*, ſo neither ſhould the voice of truth bee heard in this diſpute by reaſon of your vociferation and clamorouſneſſe. For thus you come vpon mee, *How dare you deale thus, That you dare bee ſo bold, with what face can you accuſe, I tell you there is but one faith, I tell you it is ridiculous and blaſphemous, I tell you Faith is a knowledge, I tell you the promiſe is not conditionall, O hominis acumen & argumentum lepidum, O yee noble Schollers, Wo vnto you, You cannot eſcape Gods hand, Quite contrary is this to your knowledge and conſcience, Goe diſpute with Ieſus Chriſt and tell him his Father deliuereth a blaſphemous abſurdity, All Fathers, all Writers, old and new, Greeke and Latin for 1600. yeeres*, beſides many other ſuch peremptory and confident ſpeeches. *Quintilian* thought it ſcarce worthy to bee remembred in his Inſtitutions, that his Orator bee not turbulent and tumultuous as are they who are vnlettered: and therefore I marueil how you who would bee counted as wiſe as *Thales*, could forget your ſelfe ſo much as to imitate baſe barriſters and pettifoggers. Saue only, as the ſame *Quintilian* ſaith, it was neceſſary to auouch with as much contention of voice as might bee, that which otherwiſe you could not proue: that what affirmation it could not haue from truth, it might receiue from your manner of ſpeaking. But *Vanity*, ſaith Saint *Auguſtin*, *is wonderfull talkatiue, yet is not therefore ſo powerfull as verity*,

Valer. Max. l. 5. c. 2.

Inſtit. Orator. l. 6. c. 5.

Declam. 18.

De ciuit. Dei l. 5. c. 27.

for if ſhee liſt ſhee can alſo bee lowder then verity. For the ſhallower the brooke the more the murmure, and the emptier the caske the greater the ſound. And therefore I would wiſh the Reader *not to bee terrified with Torrents*, as Saint *Auguſtin* ſpeaketh, *whoſe waters make a noiſe for a time, but preſently will ceaſe and cannot long continue.* For doubtleſſe if they of the hot and dry countreyes of *Tema* and *Saba* repaire hither in hope to ſatisfy and quench their thirſt, they ſhall, as *Iob* ſaith, returne confounded and aſhamed, becauſe their brother hath deceiued them as a brooke, and as the riſing of riuers which ſuddenly are dryed vp and faile out of their places.

Enar. in Pſ. 57.

Iob. 6. 19. 20.

Theſe, *Maſter Baxter*, are the Topicall places whence all your arguments are deduced, and if I may ſo ſay, the fiue locks wherein your chiefeſt ſtrength lyeth. What impreſſions they may haue made in the minds of ſimple people I cannot tell. Perhaps they that cannot diſcerne betweene Conicall and true gold, will bee content to receiue Lupins inſteed of curran money, and ſounding words for ſound proofes. And indeed it is the manner of the vnskilfull vulgar, though reiected and refuſed as moſt incompetent, yet to beare themſelues as iudges in euery cauſe how weighty ſoeuer, and without taking any knowledge at all of the right iſſue, to pronounce him ouercome that holds his peace, and him to haue anſwered that hath not held his peace, the controuerſie to bee doubtfull or vndecidable if both parties haue ſayd alike much; whither ſide ſpeakes with more reaſon neither doe they attend, and if they doe yet can they not vnderſtand. And becauſe *Vanity*, as wee haue obſerued out of Saint *Auguſtin*, *is euermore talkatiue then verity*, and

Iudg. 16. 17.

Plaut. Pæn. & Hor. l. 1. Ep. 7.

De ciuit. Dei l. 5. c. 27.

hee

hee ſeemeth vnto them to haue ſpoken beſt who hath ſaid moſt; therefore doe they for the moſt part giue ſentence againſt the truth for vaine talking. But howſoeuer ſimple and ignorant people may iudge, ſure I am they that are wiſe and learned, will eſteeme the courſe you haue taken rather preiudiciall then any way auaileable vnto your cauſe. For *ſhould a man*, as *Iob* ſaith, *talke deceitfully for Gods cauſe?* or is the ſtrength of truth ſo empaired that ſhee can no longer ſtand but by ſuch wrie and ſiniſter meanes? Nay verily but ſhee is ſtill of ſo noble and hautie a nature that ſhee ſcorneth to haue her conqueſts empeached by ſo baſe and diſhonorable ſuccors. Deprauing of the aduerſaries words and meaning, impertinent digreſſions, diſſembling of his reaſons, and anſwers, vnchriſtian reuelling and reproaching, and tumultuous hoobubs and outcries, are the vſuall weapons of thoſe who reſolue to fight in vnrighteous quarels. But truth being pure and ſimple will not, and ſtanding firme vpon her owne baſe needs not, and becauſe falſhood hath no ſubſiſtence but only by her, cannot bee aſſiſted and ſupported by ſuch vniuſt and fraudulent policies. Although therefore as I haue ſaid theſe meanes may bee forcible inough to ſeduce and beguile ſimple people, yet they that are wiſe and iudicious know that naked truth neuer comes diſguiſed, either in a Wolues or Foxes caſe: but prudently diſcerning and ſeparating betwixt paſſionate ſpeeches and ſound reaſons, Rhetoricall flouriſhes and Logicall demonſtrations, vnneceſſary circumſtances and ſubſtantiall matter, iudge alwayes of controuerſies not by what is confidently ſaid and affirmed, but by what is reaſonable alledged and proued. And whoſoeuer thou bee Chriſtian Reader, that art in Iob. 13. 7.

Deut. 33. 8. Exod. 28. 30. Mal. 2. 7. this ſort affected and qualified, eſpecially if thou bee *the man of Gods mercies, vpon whoſe heart the Lords Vrim and Thummim are ſet, whoſe lips preſerue knowledge, and at whoſe mouth the Law is to bee ſought, becauſe thou art the Angell of the Lord of Hoſts*: to thee, and to thy vpright and vnpartiall cenſure doe I moſt humbly ſubmit my ſelfe, and my whole proceedings in this cauſe. If Pſ. 141. 5. thou approue, it ſhall the more confirme and ſettle mee in the truth: if thou reproue, it ſhall not breake my head, but bee vnto mee a moſt ſoueraigne and pretious ointment. Iudge therefore betweene vs both indifferently and freely, and the Lord giue thee a right iudgement in all things.

2 Tim. 2. 7. And thus, *Maſter Baxter*, haue you at length my whole and entire Apologie, not importunately and violently wreſted from mee, as you ſay your Anſwer was from you, but voluntarily of mine owne accord endited for the information and ſatisfaction of thoſe who earneſtly expect the iſſue of this combat. Whereby the prudent and diſcreet Reader, and I hope your ſelfe alſo may perceiue how ſmall cauſe you had ſo vnſeaſonably to ſing your *Paan* in your Prologue, and to trumpet out victory before you were entred in the liſts. If for all this as yet you reſt vnſatisfied, the fault is your owne and not mine: for I cannot, as *Euripides* ſaith, *fill him that is not* Eurip. *ſtaunch, powring wiſe ſayings into a man that is not wiſe.* And yet it may bee your Conſcience and inward man are fully ſatisfied although ambition and vaineglory cauſe you to diſſemble it. If without all paraphraſe and circumlocution I call a ſpade a ſpade, and giue the right name vnto euery thing, I beſeech you, beare a little with Plut. Apophth. the ingenuity of my nature, wee Macedonians are ſome-

what

what rude. And yet I would haue you know that it is not ſo much your ignorance as your inſolency which I inueigh againſt. For, as a late learned Humaniſt writeth, *There is no mortall man but is in ſome degree, tainted with ignorance, and this contagion haue wee drawne from mortality it ſelfe: for man when hee erreth, erreth becauſe hee is a man, and to vpbraid error in man is to reproch euen mortality in ſelfe.* Which if you had ſeriouſly and duly conſidered, either you would not with ſuch petulancy haue beene caried againſt the errors you imagine to be in mee, or at leaſt you would haue remembred your ſelfe alſo to be a man. But ſeeing you count your ſelfe the only wiſe-man, and others, as the Poët ſpeaketh, to fly about like ſhadowes: you may not thinke it hard, if being both ignorant and inſolent, you be admoniſhed of the one, and chaſtiſed for the other.

Yuo Vilio-mar. in Rob. Tit.

Homer.

OF THE FAITH OF INFANTS,

AND HOW THEY ARE Iuſtified and Saued.

By the late Reuerend and Learned Diuine Maſter Iohn Downe, *Bachelour of Diuinity, and ſometimes Fellow of Emanuell Colledge in Cambridge.*

OXFORD,
Printed by IOHN LICHFIELD, for EDWARD FORREST, Anno Domini M. DC. XXXV.

OF THE FAITH OF INFANTS,

AND HOW THEY ARE

initiated and Saved.

OF THE FAITH OF INFANTS, AND HOW THEY ARE *Iustified and Saued.*

THat Christian Infants haue a particular Faith of their owne, is generally affirmed both by *Papists* and *Lutherans*: yet with some difference, as *Bellarmine* writeth. For *Papists* hold that they haue onely *Habituall Faith*, and that it (together with Hope and Charity) is infused into them in the *Sacrament* of *Baptisme*: but the *Lutherans*, saith he, attribute vnto them *Actuall Faith*, or something like thereunto

De Bapt. l. 1. c. 10.

unto. Wherein it may be the *Cardinall* doth them ſome wrong. For it is obſerued by ſome *Diuines*, that they conſtantly deny Children to haue any actuall apprehenſion of Gods mercies, or that they feele in themſelues any ſuch motions of Faith. Whereupon it muſt needs follow, that their meaning is not to attribute vnto them *Actuall Faith*, but a kind of *Habituall Faith* onely, or that ſeed, root and Habit, whence *Actuall* motions in due time doe flow. But bee their opinion herein whatſoeuer it will bee, ſure I am that both *Lutheran* and *Papiſt* agree in this, that *Infants* haue a particular *Faith* of their owne.

Field Append. part. 2. §. 1.

The principall reaſons that they alledge for proofe hereof are theſe. *Infants* pleaſe God: but *without Faith, it is impoſſible to pleaſe him. The Kingdome of God belongs vnto them:* Which yet the *Scriptures* ſay cannot be attained without *Faith*. The Word of God euery where maketh particular *Faith* a neceſſary meanes vnto *Iuſtification* and *Saluation*, as where the Prophet ſaith, *The iuſt man ſhall liue by his Faith:* but *Infants* are iuſtified before God, and being iuſtified cannot but bee ſaued. Nay Chriſt himſelfe expreſly ſaith that they doe beleeue: And *Iohn* the *Baptiſt* in the very wombe of his Mother was filled with the Holy Ghoſt, and ſprang at the ſalutation of the Bleſſed Virgin. Other arguments they vſe, but they are all of the like nature, and notwithſtanding them all, I cannot bee perſwaded that *Infants* while they are ſuch, haue any *Faith* of their owne either *Actuall* or *Habituall*. And theſe among ſundry others are my chiefeſt reaſons.

Heb. 11. 6. Mat. 19. 14. Hab. 2. 4. Matt 18. 6. Mar. 9. 36. Luc. 1. 41.

Deut. 1. 39. Firſt, the Scripture in plaine tearmes affirmeth, that they haue no knowledge at all, either of good or euill:

and

and that they cannot ſo much as diſcerne betweene the right and the left hand. If ſo, how can they who conceiue not of things naturall, vnderſtand thoſe things that are heauenly and aboue the pitch of nature? To this effect Saint *Auguſtin*, *Scire diuina paruuli qui nec humana adhuc norunt, ſi verbis velimus oſtendere, vereor ne ipſi ſenſibus noſtris facere videamur iniuriam, quando id quando ſuadere ſtudemus, vbi omnes vires officium, ſermonis ſuperet euidentia veritatis*: that is, If wee ſhould goe about to demonſtrate with words that Children know the things of God, who as yet know not the things of men, I feare wee ſhould offer wrong euen to our very ſenſes endeuouring to perſwade by ſpeech that, the euidence of the truth whereof far exceeds all power and office of ſpeech. Ion. 4. 11. Epiſt. 57.

Secondly, when *Infants* are preſented at the holy Font, and either ſprinkled with the water of *Baptiſme*, or dipped therein: how chanceth it that they ſo much diſlike thereof, teſtifying their diſlike by their crying and other motion of the body? Certainly, had they *actuall Faith*, they would endure all with much patience and cheerefulneſſe, and neuer bewray ſo much aduerſeneſſe and diſcontent. But if in doing ſo they goe againſt their knowledge, the *Sacrament* muſt needs be ſo farre from auailing them to the waſhing away of *Originall* guilt, that by their reluctation they rather contract a further guilt of *Actuall ſinne*, which I ſuppoſe none except he be too too vncharitable will imagine of them.

Thirdly, if they haue *Faith*, why are they not aſſoone their initiation by *Baptiſme*, forthwith admitted vnto holy *Communion*? In the time of Saint *Auguſtine*, and *Innocent* the firſt, it was the practice of the *Church* ſo to doe:

doe: and it continued, as ſome write, for the ſpace of ſixe hundred yeeres, downe vnto the times of *Ludouicus Pius*, and *Lotharius*. But why is that cuſtome now growne out of vſe, and why are Children barred from the *Euchariſt*, if they beliue as well as elder people? Nay why are they not rather admitted then thoſe of riper yeeres? For *Infants* haue not ſo much as euill thoughts in them: but theſe by reaſon of their longer life haue made themſelues guilty of many euill deeds beſides.

Fourthly, *Faith*, as Saint *Paul* witneſſeth, *commeth by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God preached.* But *Infants* heare not, neither by the eare, nor by any other way proportionable thereunto: or if they doe, yet they vnderſtand not what they heare. For did they vnderſtand, I preſume they would harken more attentiuely vnto what is ſaid, then we ſee they doe. Wherefore not hearing, neither doe they beliue. If you ſay, they beliue by an inward *Hearing*: then is that *Faith* wrought either by *Ordinary* or *Extraordinary* meanes. Not by *Extraordinary* meanes, for it is done euery day and houre. By *Ordinary* therefore. If ſo, then haue wee a double manner of working *Faith*, and both of them *Ordinary*: the one by *Inward Hearing* in *Infants* only, the other by *Inward* and *Outward* alſo in thoſe that are *Adulti*; which is a meere nouelty in the Church of God.

Fiftly, how commeth it to paſſe, if Children haue Faith, that among ſo many millions of them as haue beene in the world, not ſo much as one of them when they come to riper yeares, giueth any teſtimony of his *Faith* vntill hee bee farther taught and informed? If a child borne of Chriſtian parents, and entred into the viſible

ſible Church by Baptiſme, ſhall afterwards while hee is yet in his tender yeeres fall into the hands of *Infidels* or *Turks*, (as the more the pitie many thouſands of them haue done, and the whole band of *Ianizars*), they ſay, conſiſts of no other) doth hee not readily receiue that religion, which is firſt inſtilled into him, without once dreaming of the *Chriſtian Faith?* Which yet how it ſhould bee, hauing from his firſt infancy beene ſeaſoned and ſanctified with the *Chriſtian Faith*, cannot eaſily be conceiued or imagined.

Sixtly, tell mee, doe all that haue receiued *Faith* in their infancy looſe it againe when they come to bee of more yeeres? It ſeemeth ſo, if then they receiued it: for otherwiſe, why are they put to their *Catechiſme*, and taught the elements of *Faith* againe? But this were a very ſtrange courſe: For how ſhould they looſe it? vnleſſe perhaps God ſecretly ſteale that from them which earſt he gaue them: which to ſay, is very derogatory to the bounty of God, who neuer withdraweth grace once giuen, vntill man by abuſing it haue deſerued to looſe it. Not looſing it therefore, and yet learning it when they come to yeeres of capacity, It is a plaine argument they neuer receiued it in their *Infancy*.

Seuenthly and laſtly, there is not the leaſt Habit, either acquired by cuſtome, or infuſed from aboue but maketh a man more apt and prone vnto their proper actions. For example, whoſoeuer is poſſeſſed of the vertues of *Iuſtice*, *Temperance*, *Liberality*, *Fortitude*, will readily doe iuſtly, temperatly, liberally, valiantly: it being the nature of *Habits* to facilitate *Actions*. Tell mee then, are the Children of Chriſtians when they come firſt to be inſtructed more capable of Chriſtian Religion,

or more inclinable to holy actions, then the Children of *Infidels?* Experience tels vs they are not, but are as waxe indifferently flexible any way. It is absurd therefore and void of reason to place in *Infants* the Habit of *Faith*, which yet inclines them no more to the Acts of *Faith*, then those that are without it.

Now hauing thus briefly demonstrated that *Infants* haue neither *Actuall* nor *Habituall Faith*: it followeth in the next place to answer the contrary arguments aboue set downe. And first where it is said, that *Faith* is a necessary meanes vnto *Iustification* and *Saluation*, in as much as none can please God or liue without it: I answer in a word, it is to bee vnderstood not of *Infants*; But *de Adultis* of those that are of riper yeeres, vnto whom alone *Faith* is necessary. These cannot please God, nor liue, nor bee iustified and saued without a particular *Faith* of their owne: but *Infants* by reason of their incapacity through the indulgence of God may. Adde hereunto, that according to the *Tenent* of our *Diuines*, it is not the *Habit* but the *Act* of *Faith* that doth iustify: in regard whereof they define it by a *Motion* of the *Will* grounded vpon an assent of the *Mind* vnto the truth of the Gospell. Vnlesse therefore, you grant vnto *Infants* such a motion both of the *Mind* and *Will*, which *Papists* expresly deny, and *Lutherans* seeme to stagger at, neither can they bee iustified by *Actuall Faith*, hauing none. And seeing without it the *Habit* auailes nothing at all, as being an idle *Faith*: I see not to what end the Habit should bee infused. And if it bee to no end, neither is it infused. For if *Nature* doe not, much lesse doth God any thing in vaine.

To that of our Sauiour where hee seemeth expresly to affirme

affirme that Little-ones beleiue: I anſwer firſt, that thoſe Little-ones are not *Infants* properly, but ſuch men as reſemble little Children in holy Innocence & Simplicity: in regard whereof they are elſewhere called by Chriſt *πάιδια*, that is Infants. Secondly, grant it that Children bee alſo meant, yet not ſuch Children as are infants, but growne to ſome ſtature and capacity. For although the Child whom Chriſt tooke in his armes, be called *παιδίον*, a little Child: yet was hee both a follower and hearer of Chriſt, and ſuch a one as in ſome meaſure could vnderſtand, ſuch as were thoſe *παιδία* little Children to whom Saint *Iohn* thought it not vnfit to write. For as the text ſaith, hee was one that came of himſelfe being called: and farther, hee was capable of ſcandall and offence which queſtionleſſe is not incident vnto *Infants*. Mat. 11. 25. 1 Ioh. 2. 14.

Laſtly, to the example of *Iohn the Baptiſt*, I anſwer with *Saint Auguſtin*, *Nec quod factum eſt in Iohanne contemno, nec inde regulam quid ſentiendum ſit de parvulis figo: immò id in illo mirabiliter prædico, quia in aliis non inuenio*: Neither doe I contemne, ſaith hee, that which was done in *Iohn*, neither doe I from thence frame a rule what wee are to thinke of little-ones: yea I acknowledge it to bee marueilous in him, becauſe I find it not in others. Moreouer, it is not ſaid of him *Credidit in vtero*, he beleiued in the wombe, but only *exultauit*, he ſprang in the wombe: & this *exultation* or *Springing*, *diuinitùs facta eſt in Infante, non humanitùs ab Infante*, was done by the power of God in the Infant, and not by any humane power of the Infant. Or if vſe of reaſon and will, were ſo haſtned vnto him as hee did beleiue, *in miraculis habendum eſt diuinæ potentiæ, non ad humanæ trahendum eſt exemplar naturæ*: it is to bee reckoned among the miracles. Ep. 57.

racles of Gods power, and not to be drawne into an example of human nature. And thus much of reaſons both for and againſt the *Faith* of *Infants*.

Now I know it will here farther bee demanded, if *Infants* haue neither *Actuall* nor *Habituall Faith* of their owne, how then and by what meanes are they *Iuſtified* and *Saued*? For it is mercileſſe, and againſt all *Diuinity* to exclude them from either. Whereunto I anſwer in the words of *Bernard*, *Saluantur & ipſi per fidem, non ſuam, ſed alienam*: they are alſo ſaued by *Faith*, yet not their owne *Faith* but anothers. Anothers? Will you ſay: this ſeemeth very ſtrange. Heare then what the ſame *Bernard* yet further addeth, *Dignum eſt & ad Dei ſpectat dignitatem, vt quibus fidem ætas denegat propriam, gratia concedat prodeſſe alienam*: It is fit and belongs vnto the dignity of God, that to whom age denies a proper *Faith* of their owne, grace ſhould yeeld them the benefit of anothers *Faith*. And againe, *Nec enim omnipotentis iuſtitia propriam ab his putat exigendam fidem, quos nouit propriam nullam habere culpam*: for neither doth the iuſtice of God Almighty thinke that a proper *Faith* is to bee required of thoſe, whom he knowes to haue no proper fault of their owne. In which words of *Bernard*, two excellent reaſons are rendred, why the *Faith* of another through the grace and indulgence of God ſhould bee auailable vnto them: the firſt becauſe their *Infancy* denies vnto them a proper *Faith* of their owne, the ſecond becauſe beſides that *Originall Corruption* traduced into them from their parents without their knowledge or conſent, they haue no other ſinne of their owne. Can they not then by reaſon of their tender yeeres haue a *Faith* of their owne? It beſits the goodnes

Epiſt. 77. 501

of

of God that they bee holpen by the *Faith* of another. Haue they no proper and particular ſinne of their owne? Neither doth God thinke it agreeable with his iuſtice to exact of them a proper and particular Faith of their owne.

Infants then are holpen by anothers *Faith*. Whoſe *Faith* will you ſay? The *Faith* of the *Parents*, as alſo of the *Church*, who is the common mother of vs all, and in whoſe wombe as it were they are conceiued & borne. This of old was Saint *Auguſtins* ſentence, and this all ſound Diuines haue agreeably with the *Scripture* euer held. Onely it may be demanded how and in what ſort the *Parents Faith* auaileth them. Whereunto I anſwer, not by particular applying of Chriſts merits and obedience vnto them (for this is done onely by a mans owne *Faith* vnto himſelfe) but by bringing them within the compaſſe of the *Couenant* of *Grace*. Thus; The *Couenant* was made not with *Abraham* onely, but with his ſeed alſo: and the *Promiſe*, ſaith Saint *Peter*, was giuen both to the *Parents* and to the *Children*. The Parents therefore by Faith apprehending this Promiſe and Couenant, by their Faith intereſt their *Children* alſo thereunto. For as it is in ciuill negotiations, the bargaine that the Father maketh for himſelfe & his Children is firme and good, although the *Children* bee not preſent at the bargaine-making, nor vnderſtand what is done: euen ſo in this ſpirituall Couenant and contract with God, the *Parents Act* is ſufficient force to confederate their *Children* alſo, and to giue them a right vnto all the benefits of the *Couenant*. And as I conceiue, this is imputed vnto them in lieu of all thoſe *Acts* and *Habits* which otherwiſe are required in thoſe that are *Adulti*. How farther

Gen. 17. 19. Act. 2. 39.

the Holy Ghoſt worketh in them is a deepe and inſcrutable ſecret, *Et de occultis non iudicat Eccleſia*, the Church is no iudge of things that are hidden. Onely I affirme that by the Faith of the *Parents* the *Children* are made a holy ſeed, and members of Chriſts body.

But what if one of the *Parents* bee an *Infidell*? What if either of them, or both be notorious hypocrites or openly ſinnefull, hauing not in them true Iuſtifying *Faith*? are the *Children* therefore, without the compaſſe of the *Couenant*, and vniuſtified before God? I anſwer, No: For firſt, if but one of the *Parents* belieue, yet are the *Children* holy. So ſaith Saint *Paul*, *The vnbelieuing husband is ſanctified by the belieuing wife, and the vnbelieuing wife is ſanctified by the husband: elſe were your Children vncleane, but now are they holy.* Againe, though neither of the *Parents* belieue with iuſtifying *Faith*, yet being in the Church by the profeſſion of Chriſtian Religion, their Children are within the *Couenant*. For firſt, *the Soule that ſinneth it ſhall die: the ſonne ſhall not beare the iniquity of the Father, neither ſhall the Father beare the iniquity of the Sonne.* So that the impiety of the *Parents* preiudiceth not the Child that is borne in the Church. Secondly, by *Parents* are to bee vnderſtood not thoſe alone of whom Children are immediatly begotten and borne: but their Progenitors and Anceſtors alſo who feared God and liued in the Church, though many generations before. For God made not his *Couenant* with *Abraham* and his immediate ſeed onely, but with all his ſeed after them in their generations: and promiſeth *to ſhew mercy* to the thouſandth generation of them that *loue him and keep his Commandments*. Whence it followeth, that theſe are as it were a root vnto all their poſte-

1. Cor. 7. 14.

Ezech. 18. 20.

Gen. 17. 7. Ex. 20.

poſterity borne in the Church: and therefore, *if the root be holy, ſo are the branches* alſo, ſaith Saint *Paul*. Laſtly, Rom. 11. 16.
bee the next *Parents* whatſoeuer they will bee, yet their *Children* being borne in the *Church*, the *Church* is their *Mother*, and the *Faith* and piety of the Church intereſteth all ſuch as are borne in her vnto the *Couenant*. And thus you ſee how Children are iuſtified and Saued by anothers Faith.

If Children, may not thoſe that are *Adulti* ſo bee *iuſtified* and *ſaued* alſo? No verily. For as the Prophet ſaith, *The iuſt man ſhall liue ſuâ fide*, not by anothers, Hab. 2. 4.
but by his owne *Faith*. And hence is it, that in the Lords prayer we are taught to ſay *Our Father*, but in the Creed, *I believe*: becauſe Prayer is an Act of Charity extending it ſelfe vnto the good of others alſo, but Believing is an Act of Faith, onely benefiting a mans ſelfe. Can the cloths that another weares, warme mee? or the meat another eates, nouriſh mee? or the potion another receiues, cure mee? or the ſoule that is in another man quicken mee? Nor more can the Faith of another man iuſtify or ſaue mee. As one man ſhall not beare anothers fault, *ſed anima quæ peccat ipſa morietur*, the ſoule that ſinneth it ſhall die: ſo ſhall not one man bee acquitted for anothers *Faith*, *ſed anima quæ credit ipſa ſaluabitur*, the ſoule that believeth it ſhall bee ſaued. Saluation euery where in Scripture is promiſed to him who himſelfe believeth; and damnation is euery where threatned to him that believeth not ſo. And he believeth not ſo, who hath not a Faith of his owne.

Yea but if *Adams* ſinne bee imputed vnto vs for *Condemnation*, and the *Obedience* of *Chriſt* for *Iuſtification*: why may not anothers *Faith* alſo bee imputed for *Saluation*?

5 st. nation? The caſe is not alike, for they were publicke perſons and ſtood in our ſteed: but ſo doe not others. In the *Couenant* of works *Adam* was our *Head*: and therefore his ſinne is counted the common act of all thoſe that were in his loines. In the *Couenant* of *Grace*, *Chriſt* is our *Head*: and therefore his *Obedience* is eſteemed the common *Obedience* of all thoſe who are vnited vnto him by *Faith*. Others are not our *Heads*, nor repreſent our perſons: in regard whereof neither can their Act bee accounted ours. It will further bee obiected that Chriſt forgaue the palſie-ſicke man his ſinnes for the *Faith* of them that brought him: and ſo, as *Thomas* ſaith both *Ambroſe* and one *Iohn* a Biſhop vnderſtand it. But Saint *Chryſoſtome* otherwiſe, and that more rightly, vnderſtanding it both of the ſicke mans Faith and theirs who brought him. For our Sauiour intending to beſtow a double benefit vpon him namely the cure both of body and ſoule: this could not bee effected but by the interuention of his owne Faith, but the other might by the Faith of thoſe that preſented him. So wee read that the *Centurions* ſeruant, and the woman of *Canaans* daughter were healed, the one for his Maſters, the other for her Mothers *Faith*. And who knowes not that vnbelieuers oftentimes temporally fare the better for the ſake of the *Faithfull*. Saint *Ambroſe* therefore imputing the remiſſion of ſinnes vnto the Faith of others, muſt bee vnderſtood with a graine of Salt, as they ſay, that one mans Faith may obtaine Faith vnto another, and ſo conſequently by the interuention thereof *Iuſtification* alſo: as did the *Faith* of S. *Steuen* (as ſome ſuppoſe) vnto S. *Paul*, and the teares of *Monica* vnto her Sonne *Auguſtin*. Thus thoſe that are *Adulti* muſt haue a Faith of their owne.

Luc. 5. 20.

Caten. in eum loc.

Mat. 8. 13. & 15. 28.

And

And why I pray you more then *Infants*? The reaſon is euident. For firſt thoſe that are *Adulti* are capable of *Faith*, ſo are not *Infants*: and therefore reaſon would that they ſhould haue a Faith of their owne, though theſe bee holpen by the Faith of another. Againe, they that are growne to riper yeeres haue in them more deadly diſeaſes then *Infants*: and ſo need more remedies then theſe. *Infants* indeed are borne in Originall corruption propagated vnto them from *Adam*: but of *Actuall* ſinnes they are not guilty, neither are they defiled with the fruites of that bitter root. And therefore vnto them ſufficeth thorow the gracious *Couenant* of *God* the *Parents Faith*. But to thoſe that are *Adulti*, who are ſtained not onely with *Originall* ſinne, but alſo with many *Actuall* tranſgreſſions by themſelues committed in thought, word and deed, it is requiſite that by a particular *Faith* of their owne they apprehend the merits and obedience of Chriſt for their *Iuſtification* and *Saluation*. In a word, anothers *Faith* (as is aboue ſaid) may by diuine diſpenſation and indulgence ſuffice to him who hath onely ſinned in another: but to him who himſelfe hath ſinned, not anothers but his owne particular Faith is neceſſary.

Now, to conclude all with a little application, ſeeing all theſe things are ſo, firſt, wee haue here the great priuiledge and prerogatiue of *Chriſtian Children* aboue others. For by vertue of the Couenant they are a holy ſeed, haue right to the promiſes, and the Kingdome of Heauen belongeth vnto them. Hence is it that anciently vnder the law they were Circumcized, and now vnder the Goſpell are admitted vnto *Baptiſme*, the ſeale of the *Couenant* of grace. In ſo much, that whoſoeuer of them

depart this life in their infancy and tender yeeres, vndoubtedly they are all and euery one of them ſaued. What ſhould let? Can they that are holy periſh? Will God fayle of his Word to thoſe that haue right to the promiſes? Shall they to whom the Kingdome of Heauen belongeth bee excluded from it? *Originall* ſinne is pardoned them in the *Couenant*, and waſhed away in the lauer of regeneration; other ſinne they haue none to hinder them, and therefore without doubt ſo ſoone as they die their innocent ſoules are by the holy *Angels* of God tranſported into *Abrahams* boſome. Neither let any man thinke that herein I ſtand ſingle, and by my ſelfe, for thus a reuerend Biſhop alſo of this Church; *I pray what did antiquity teach? that young Children Baptized are deliuered from Originall ſinne? Wee teach the ſame, and doubt not but if they die before they come to the practice of actuall ſinne, they ſhall bee ſaued.* And our Diuines in the *Councell* of *Dort*, *Infantes ante vſum rationis morientes electi:* Infants dying before the vſe of reaſon are elected. And the booke of *Homilies*, *Infants being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this Sacrifice waſhed from ſinne, brought into Gods fauour, made his children and inheritors of the Kingdome of Heauen.* More I could name, but theſe may ſuffice to let you know how vnlikely it is that ſhould bee *Arminianiſme* (for ſo hath this opinion raſhly beene cenſured of ſome) which the Church of England, and the profeſſed enemies of *Arminians* hold.

Carleton, ag. Montag.

Synod. Dord.

Tom. 1. Hom. 2. p. 1.

But what? are none ſaued but onely the *Children* of *Chriſtians*? Or doe you condemne all the reſt vniuerſally vnto the pit of Hell? I will tell you what as graue and learned a Diuine as any this age hath yeelded holdeth. He

Iun. de nat. & grat. 28. 50.

Hee doubteth not but that many of the *Children* of *Infidels* are ſaued, partly by vertue of the Couenant, and partly by Gods election. By *vertue* of the *Couenant*, in as much as they are deſcended of ſuch Anceſtors as haue apprehended the *Couenant*, although their ſucceſſion haue afterwards ſuffered ſome interruption. By *Election*, becauſe God hath not barred himſelfe from power and right to communicate grace euen to thoſe whoſe Anceſtors pertained not to the *Couenant*. For if hee call thoſe *Adulti* into the *Couenant* who before were not of it: why may hee not in like manner if hee pleaſe chuſe *Infants* alſo? Finally, as hee belieueth all that are in the *Couenant*, and that are elected, to bee ſaued: ſo in Charity hee preſumeth all that dye in their *Infancy* rather to bee ſaued then ſhut out of the Kingdome of Heauen. For my part, I will anſwer no otherwiſe then in the words of Saint *Paul*, *What haue I to doe to iudge them that are without? Doe yee not iudge them that are within? But God iudgeth them that are without.* And ſo to his righteous iudgement I leaue them. 1 Cor. 5. 12. 13.

Againe, here haue wee double comfort for all Chriſtian Parents. And firſt, in the birth of their Children: ſeeing they are holy and belong vnto the Couenant of Grace. True it is the Scripture ſaith, *they are conceiued and borne in ſinne*, and ſo the *Children of Wrath*: but you are to know that they repreſent a double perſon, one of a Sonne of *Adam*, the other of one ingrafted into Chriſt. As they are the Sonnes of *Adam* they are bone ſinfull; as ingrafted into Chriſt, freed from ſinne. Secondly, in their death: for they may bee aſſured by *Faith* that they are tranſlated into thoſe ioyes, which eye hath not ſeene, nor eare euer heard, nor hath euer entred into the heart of Pſal. 51. 7. Eph. 2. 3.

of man. Of elder people they can but hope it in *Charity*: of theſe they haue infallible certainty. If they liue vnto more yeeres, who knoweth but *wickedneſſe may alter their vnderſtanding, or deceit beguile their mind*, as the wiſe man ſaith? But now being preuented by death, they are quickly paſſed this vale of miſery, and haue ſoone ended their painfull pilgrimage, and are poſſeſſed of the place of eternall reſt and happyneſſe. If any thing will drie vp the teares, or ſtint the ſighs and cries and lamentations of Parents for the loſſe of their tender *Infants*, this is it: eſpecially if they conſider withall, that themſelues vnder God haue beene the meanes of bringing them within the *Couenant*, and procuring vnto them their euerlaſting *Saluation*.

Sap. 4. 11.

Thirdly, *Parents* may hence learne that a neceſſity is laid vpon them to preſent their *Children* vnto the holy Font, ſo ſoone as conueniently they may. For ſeeing by their birth they are intereſted vnto the *Couenant*, the ſeale of the *Couenant* muſt not in any caſe be ſleighted or neglected. What though *Baptiſme* be not abſolutely neceſſary vnto them? yet is it neceſſary for *Parents* to giue it them conditionally, if it may bee had. If it cannot bee had, the *Vow* and *Deſire* of the *Parents* is ſufficient: neither doth the bare want of *Baptiſme* without any of his or their default, exclude the *Child* from *Saluation*. For if a iuſt and honeſt man would, much more will God performe his Word and *Couenant*, although the ſeale be not ſet thereunto. But if it may bee had, there is *Neceſſitas præcepti*, a neceſſity laid by Gods commandement vpon all thoſe that are *Filij præcepti* the Sonnes of the commandement. Thoſe Sonnes all men are when they are grown to be *Adulti*; and therefore if then they neglect

to

to be baptized, they deſerue for their contempt to bee cut off and to bee eternally condemned. But *Infants* while ſuch are none of theſe Sonnes, as being both vncapable of the precept, and vnable to offer themſelues vnto the *Sacrament*: whence followeth that the commandement taketh hold onely of the Parents, and thoſe that haue the care of them. So that although the *Child* dying vnbaptized may bee free from danger: yet thoſe that neglect to preſent him vnto *Baptiſme* ſhall bee damned for breach of Gods commandement. Let *Parents* therefore by all meanes bee carefull to performe this duty: and if by reaſon of weakeneſſe or ſome other impediment it cannot bee done publickely, rather then left vndone, let it bee done priuatly. Wiſe men, and amongſt the reſt *M. Caluin* would haue it ſo: yea the Church of *England* requireth it, preſcribing a forme of Priuate Baptiſme, in caſe of neceſſity, and commanding that what is priuatly done be by the Miniſter publickely made knowne in the *Congregation*. An order heretofore too much neglected, God grant henceforward it may be better obſerued.

Finally and laſtly, ſeeing euery one that is *Adultus* muſt of neceſſity haue a *Faith* of his owne, firſt it is the duty of *Parents* by all meanes to worke *Faith* in their *Children* when they are capable thereof: that as they haue beene inſtruments to traduce *Originall* ſinne vnto them to their perdition, ſo they may againe repaire in them the image of God to their eternall ſaluation. Secondly, let euery one looke to himſelfe, and ſee that hee haue *Faith*, for it is in vaine to truſt to the *Faith* of another. The righteouſneſſe of Chriſt indeed is a cloke large enough to couer the ſinnes of all men: but the *Faith* of

another man is little enough for himſelfe, I cannot couer my nakednesse with it. They were but fooliſh virgins that ſaid, *Giue vs of your oile, for our lamps are out:* and fitly were they anſwered by the wiſe virgins, *Wee feare there will not bee enough for vs and you, but goe yee rather to them that ſell and buy for your ſelues.* Let *Papiſts* blaſpheme and ſay, they can ſupererogate and more then ſatisfy for their ſinnes, and that one man may for a price buy out of the Popes treaſury the Surplus of another mans merits: yet am I ſure the oile of another mans lampe will not ſerue my turne, nor procure mee fauour to enter with the bridegroome. God grant me therefore wiſdome euen while it is called to day, to get mee oile in my owne lampe.

NOT

NOT CONSENT OF FATHERS BVT SCRIPTVRE THE GROVND OF FAITH.

Written by the occaſion of a conference had with Mr. Bayly, *by the late Reuerend and Learned Diuine, Maſter* Iohn Downe, *Bachelour of Diuinity, and ſometimes Fellow of Emanuell Colledge in Cambridge.*

OXFORD,
Printed by IOHN LICHFIELD, for EDWARD FORREST, Anno Domini M. DC. XXXV.

NOT CONSENT OF FATHERS BVT SCRIPTVRE THE GROVND OF FAITH.

LOVING and Reuerend *M. Bayly*, I acknowledge my ſelfe much endebted vnto you, both for my kind entertainment, and the peaceable *Conference* I had with you. Would you but vouchſafe to viſit my poore Cottage, I ſhould readily endeauour to ſatisfy ſome part of the debt, if not with like entertainment, yet with equall

welcome. The reſidue I know not how better to diſcharge, then by purſuing my firſt intention; that is, by labouring to reduce you backe into the boſome of that *Church*, out of which with ſuch danger to your ſoule, ſcandall to the brethren, and vnkindneſſe to her you haue withdrawne your ſelfe. And to this end might I haue obtained from you in writing, as at our parting I entreated, what thoſe ſpeciall *Motiues* were which had wrought in you this ſudden change: I would haue ſtrained my ſelfe by writing alſo to haue giuen them the beſt ſatisfaction. But ſeeing for reaſons beſt knowne to your ſelfe, and into which I liſt not further to inquire, you held it not fit as then to yeeld ſo farre vnto mee: I haue thought good for the preſent to reflect vpon ſome paſſages of our *Conference*, ſpecially that ground whereon you then ſtood ſo much, and vpon which you plainely profeſſed that you would aduenture your *Faith*.

It may pleaſe you therefore to remember that being demaunded a reaſon of your departure, you pretended that in reading the ancient *Fathers* you had met with ſundry *Bugbeares*, which ſo ſcared and affrighted you, that vnleſſe you would reſiſt the light of *Conſcience*, and hazard your eternall ſaluation, you could not chuſe but bee ſwayed by them. Whereunto it being replied, that happily thoſe *Bugbeares* were but *Scarcrowes*, and that you ſhould haue taken a ſafer and ſurer courſe, if you had reſolued your Faith into Scriptures, nothing being ſufficient to beare vp ſo weighty a peece but onely diuine teſtimony: your anſwer was that vpon Scripture you relyed, howbeit, becauſe it is obſcure and ſubiect to manifold conſtructions, vpon Scripture vnderſtood according to the interpretation and doctrine of the Fathers,

thers, nothing doubting but that as long as you held the Faith of them whom wee verily beleeue to bee ſaued, your ſelfe could neuer periſh through misbeliefe. In which anſwer, howſoeuer in word you ſeeme to attribute ſome force and vertue to the Scriptures, yet in truth you doe but cancell them and make them of none effect. For if the Scriptures lie rather in the Senſe then in the Letter, and the Senſe by reaſon of the darkneſſe and ambiguity of them, bee not to bee found in themſelues, but elſewhere out of them, in the writings of the Fathers: it followeth clearely that in your account *Paul* and *Peter* and *Iames* and *Iohn* and the other Pen-men of holy writ are no better then *Cyphers*, vnleſſe *Cyrill* and *Ambroſe* and *Hierome* and *Auguſtin* and the reſt of that ranke as digit numbers vouchſafe to adde ſome value and ſignification vnto them. So that now by your fauor this muſt bee my taske briefly and plainely to demonſtrate, that hauing remoued your Faith from the authority of Scripture vpon the expoſition of the Fathers, you haue built quite beſide the rocke, and layd your foundation vpon the ſand.

But take this proteſtation firſt, that wee neither diſeſteeme nor deſpiſe the Fathers, as by Prieſts and Ieſuites wee are ordinarily ſlandered: but contrarywiſe, with all duty wee riſe vp to their gray haires, and reuerence their venerable antiquity. Withall wee acknowledge that they were in their times excellent ornaments and lights of the Church, endued not onely with ſingular knowledge in the myſtery of Faith, but alſo with admirable ſanctity and vprightneſſe of life. Whereby, in all their combats and bickerins with Hereticks, they maintained the truth of God ſo wiſely and couragiouſly, that

that they euer remained more then conquerors. And now as they haue left behind them a pretious name among the Saints: ſo wee doubt not but their ſoules are bound vp in the bundle of life, and enioy the bleſſed-making viſion of God for euermore. Such books of theirs as are come to our hands wee eſteeme as rich treaſures, and value them aboue gold. Them doe wee ſearch and peruſe with all diligence: (bee it ſpoken without offence) no Papiſts more. Yet can wee not throughout them meet with thoſe terrible *Bugbears* you ſo much complaine of: rather wee wonder how you could miſſe all thoſe good Angels ſo frequently appearing in them to comfirme and ſettle you in your firſt Faith. For I wil bee bold to ſay, notwithſtanding all the brags and crakes of that ſide, that the Fathers are ours not yours: or if they bee yours in any thing, it is in the pettieſt and ſmalleſt matters, for in the maine and great queſtions controuerted betweene vs, they are expreſly for vs and againſt you, as hereafter God willing ſhall in part appeare. Vpon confidence whereof, whenſoeuer wee were ſummond and called vnto the Fathers by you, wee neuer refuſed their triall, but euer haue beene ready to aduenture all vpon their verdict. The chalenge of that famous *Prelate, Doctor Iewell Biſhop of Salisbury*, is yet freſh in memory, that *if any learned man of our aduerſaries, or if all the learned men that bee aliue, be able to bring any one ſufficient ſentence out of any old Catholicke Doctor or Father, or out of any old generall Counſell, or out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the Primitiue Church, whereby it may clearly and plainly be proued, that there was any priuate Maſſe in the whole world at that time for the ſpace of ſixe hundred yeares after* Chriſt,

Ser. at Pauls Croſſe.

Christ, and so foorth in seuen and twenty seuerall articles, *hee would bee content to yeeld and to subscribe.* This chalenge as that renowned Bishop in his life-time made good himselfe against his aduersary *Master Harding*: so was it neuer yet retracted by any of vs, but hath stoutly beene maintained by sundry succeeding champions. Reply to Hardings Ans.

Heare one for all. *That* (sayth worthy *Whitaker*), *which* Iewell *most truly and constantly vttered that day when hee appealed to the antiquity of sixe hundred yeeres, and offered vnto you, that if you could bring foorth but one sentence cleere and euident, out of any Father or Councell, he would not refuse to yeeld the victory vnto you: the same doe we all professe, we all promise the same, we will not shrinke from our word.* Thus you see how wee reiect not the Fathers, as you would beare the world in hand, but triumph rather in the testimony they giue vs, and in our Apologies and Defences alledge them plentifully against you. Con. Camp. rat. 5.

Howbeit neither doe wee nor dare wee make Gods of them, or equall them with the holy Apostles, as if they were infallible and could not erre. Clouen tongues neuer sate vpon them, as they did vpon these: neither did the Spirit of God so guide and direct their pens, but that sometimes they might faile, and write amisse. Had they had infallibility of iudgement, safely might wee build our Faith vpon them: but this they vtterly disclaime, acknowledging it to bee the peculiar priuiledge of the Apostles. And so far are they from making themselues Masters of our Faith, that they require vs to iudge and censure of their writings by the Scripture which is the rule of Faith. Neither would they haue vs to tie our selues vnto their authority more then they tyed themselues vnto the authority of others: but freely to accept

Hom. 13. in 2. Cor. or refuse as wee see iust cause. *I pray and beseech you all,* saith *Chrysostome, that leaning this and that mans opinion, you will search all these things out of the Scripture. Let it* In Euseb. hist. l. 7. c. 24. *bee commended,* saith *Dionysius of Alexandria, and without* Epist. 62. *envy assented vnto which is rightly spoken: but if any thing bee vnsoundly written, let that bee looked into and corrected. I know I my selfe,* saith *Hierome, esteeme of the Apostles in one sort, and of other Writers in another: that* De Trinit. l. 3. c. 1. *the first alwayes speake truth, and the latter as men doe in some things erre. In all my writings,* saith Saint *Augustin, I desire not only a godly Reader, but also a free corrector: yet as I would haue the Reader addicted vnto mee, so neither would I haue a corrector addicted to himselfe.* And a- De lib. arb. l. 2. c. 32. gaine, *I am not bound to the authority of this man,* meaning *Cyprian, but I examine his saying by the authority of Scripture, and what agreeth therewith I receiue with his commendation: what agreeth not, by his leaue I refuse.* And Epist. 111. ad Fortunat. yet againe, *Neither are wee to esteeme the disputations of any men although Catholicke and praise worthy as the Canonicall Scriptures, that wee may not saluing the honour which is due to those men dislike and reiect something in their writings, if happily wee find them to haue thought otherwise then the truth either by others or our selues through Gods help vnderstood: Such am I in the writings of others, and such would I haue the vnderstanders of* Epist. 19. ad Hieron. *mine to bee.* Finally, *I,* saith the same Saint *Augustin, confesse vnto your charity, that I haue learned to yeeld vnto those books of Scripture alone, which now are called Canonicall, this reuerence and honor, that I most firmely beleeue no Author of them to haue erred any thing in writing. And if I find any thing in their writings which seemeth contrary to truth, I will not sticke to say, that either, the copie is*

faulty,

faulty, or the tranſlator apprehended not what is ſpoken, or I vnderſtand it not. But others I ſo read, that how much ſoeuer they excell in holyneſſe and learning, I thinke it not therefore true becauſe they thought ſo, but becauſe either by thoſe Canonicall Authors, or by probable reaſon not abhorring from truth they were able to perſwade mee. Thus the Fathers: whoſe ſteps if wee tread in, and whoſe counſell if wee follow, and not taking vp euery thing vpon truſt, but examining them by the touchſtone of truth, I hope wee are rather to bee commended then blamed.

And reaſon: for neither were the Fathers more then men; neither are wee of this age leſſe then men. And I wonder, why we may not iudge of the ſayings of thoſe, who are but men as well as our ſelues. What? haue wee not reaſonable ſoules as well as they? are we not endued with the ſame faculty of vnderſtanding and diſcourſing? haue wee not ſtill the ſame helps both of nature and art which they had? Or when they died, did the Holy Ghoſt alſo giue vp the ghoſt with them? or doth hee deny to aſſiſt theſe latter times with his enlightning grace as hee did the former? Certainly the *Spirit that leadeth into all truth* is yet, and euer ſhall bee amongſt vs vnto the end of the world. And as before the writings of the Fathers were, hee directed his Church vnto the true ſence of Scripture: ſo now I doubt not but if all whatſoeuer they haue written were vtterly loſt, he would ſtill guide vs therein as hee did them. And verily vnleſſe wee will bee too vnthankfull wee cannot but confeſſe, that as age through Gods bounty hath had more meanes then thoſe heretofore: ſo through his bleſſing it hath made further proceedings alſo in the knowledge of Scripture. For be-

Ioh. 16. 13.

ſides that wee haue whatſoeuer helps they had, we haue ouer-and-aboue the benefit of all their works, together with much skilfulnes in the Originall of the old Teſtament, which moſt of them wanted, and of the new alſo, wherewith ſome were but little acquainted. In regard whereof whoſoeuer ſhall duly compare the ancient Commentaries with thoſe of latter times, muſt needs bee either weake in iudgement, or obſtinate in preiudice if hee preferre not theſe. Your owne men ingenuouſly acknowledge ſo much. *It cannot bee vnknowne to any*, ſaith *Fiſher B. of Rocheſter*, *that there are many things as well in other Scriptures as the Goſpels now more cleerely diſcuſſed and throughly vnderſtood then in ancient times: namely becauſe the Ancients had not the yce broken vnto them, or becauſe their age ſufficed not exactly to ſound the whole ſea of Scripture.* And *Salmeron*, *God hath not giuen to all men all, that euery age might enioy ſome truths which the former knew not. Euery age hath euer aſcribed much to antiquity: yet this wee auouch, the yonger the Doctors the cleerer ſighted.* And *Dominicus Bannes*, *It is not neceſſary that the more remote the Church is from the Apoſtles times, the leſſe perfect knowledge of the myſteries of Faith ſhould bee therein: becauſe after the Apoſtles time there were not the moſt learned in the Church which had dexteritie in vnderſtanding the matters of Faith. Wee are not therefore enwrapped in the more darkneſſe, for that in reſpect of time wee are more diſtant from Chriſt: but rather the Doctors of theſe latter times being godly, and treading in the ſteps of the ancient Fathers, haue attained more expreſſe vnderſtanding in ſome things then they had. For they are like children ſtanding on the ſhoulders of Giants, who being lifted by the talneſſe of Giants, no marueil if*

Art. 18. cont. Luther.

In Rom. 5. diſp. 51.

if they see further then they themselues. This similitude Stella also vseth to the same purpose, *God forbid*, saith he *that I should condemne what such and so many wise men haue with one accord affirmed: yet wee know well that Pigmies set on the shoulders of Giants, see further then the Giants themselues doe.* Thus they. Whereby you see the Fathers haue no prerogatiue aboue vs, because they were before vs: but wee rather haue the aduantage because wee come after them. In a word, bee they what soeuer you will, their seruants wee are not, but their fellow seruants: sent from God with the same commission, to the same end, and with the same promises that they were. Neither doth their authority more bind vs in that they are our predecessors, then our authority shall bind them who many ages hereafter may be our successors. But draw we a little closer. In Luc. 10.

The ancient Fathers say you, are the ground of your Faith. What? seuerally and single by themselues? I suppose no: for there is not one of them, as your owne side confesseth, but hath his error, and I presume you would bee loth to follow them therein. The Fathers therefore, either all iointly, or the more part of them agreeing in one. So *Canus*, *What the greater part of the Fathers iudgeth, that wee professe to bee of the Catholicke Faith.* So *Salmeron* also, *When all or almost all Fathers agree in one, it is an inexcusable argument.* And *Gregory of Valentia*, *It is infallibly true which they deliuer with one consent, yea an infallible rule in dging.* And *Onuphrius*, *It is rash and foolish and terrible rashnesse to goe against a sense giuen by the Fathers for the vnderstanding of the Scriptures.* And finally the *Councell of Trent*, which peremptorily chargeth, *that no man dare to interprete the Scriptures against* Loc. lib. 7. c. 3. In 1. Ioh. 3. disp. 25. Anal. l. 8. c. 8. Prim. Pap. p. 1. c. 6.

the Vnanimous consent of the Fathers. This then vndoubtedly being your assertion, as euery way according with the *Tenet of the Church of Rome*, let vs in Gods name trie the strength thereof; and see with what security and safety a man may aduenture his Faith, and consequently his eternall saluation vpon this ground.

And first, whosoeuer will stedfastly repose his Faith vpon consent of Fathers, had need be right well assured which are the authenticall writings of the Fathers. For if these bee doubtfull and vncertaine, the whole frame raised vpon them must of necessity shake and totter. Now, that there are bookes more then a good many which in their forefronts are inscribed and entitled vnto the Fathers, yet in truth are meerely suppositious and apocryphall, I know you cannot bee ignorant. Nor *Origen*, nor *Athanasius*, nor *Basil*, nor *Chrysostome*, nor *Cyrill*, nor *Tertullian*, nor *Cyprian*, not *Ambrose*, not *Hierome*, nor *Augustin*, nor any one almost of all the Fathers, but hath suffered notorious wrong in this kind, hauing base brats and misbegotten bastards fathered vpon him. Which also is so cleere and manifest, that *Possevin*, and *Salmeron*, and *Maldonat*, and *Baronius*, and *Bellarmine*, and all the rest of that side, though too frequently they make vse of such refuse stuffe, yet euery where in their writings are constrained to acknowledge so much. But amongst the rest *Sixtus Senensis* especially, who purposely recording the works of all the Fathers, taketh vpon him to demonstrate as much in euery one of them, as in his Catalogue hee passeth from one Father to another. So that indeed it would bee but an idle wasting both of oile and time if I should spend many words in proofe of that which is denied of none: and

Biblioth. l. 4.

there-

therefore I forbeare further to trouble you with particularity. Only, because in our Conference you so confidently affirmed that *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, euen he who was Saint *Pauls* conuert and Scholler, was the right Author of all those bookes that are now extant vnder his name: I must entreat you to haue a little patience, while I maintaine against you the negatiue which I then held, and for which I stand still engaged vnto you.

That this *Denise* is but a counterfait, our Diuines proue by sundry vnanswerable arguments: I will not vrge them all, but cull out the choicest. Omitting therefore the Stile sauouring more of three hundred yeeres after, then those Apostolicall times, and his curious speculations in the secrets of heauen, as if hee had beene surueyer thereof, or had taken a muster of all the heauenly hoste of the blessed Spirits therein; whereas Saint *Paul* himselfe though hee had beene rauished vp into the third heauen, euen into the Paradise of God, yet returning backe neyther durst nor did vtter any such thing, and lastly that hee talketh so familiarly of Churches and Chancels and Monks and diuers other orders and ceremonies which are well knowne to be of a much latter date: omitting I say these and the like obiections, although perhaps not so easy to bee answered, consider with mee I beseech you these few reasons following. First, if these were the bookes of that *Denis* which was Saint *Pauls* Scholler, how commeth it to passe that neither *Eusebius* in his *Ecclesiasticall history*, nor *Ierome*, nor *Gennadius* purposely writing Catalogues of all the famous Writers before them, nor *Origen*, nor *Chrysostom* nor any ancient Father, so farre as I can learne, maketh

2 Cor. 12. 3, 4.

any

any mention of them, vntill *Gregory the Great*, who li-
Hom. 34. de 10. dragm. ued about 600. yeares after Christ, and speaketh very doubtfully of them too? For as for *Athanasius* whom you affirmed to quote him, I suppose you meant him in his Questions out of the old and new Testament, wherein hee cites his *Mystica Theologia*. But neither was this booke of *Denis* knowne in the time of *Athanasius*, nor
Biblioth. l. 4. did *Athanasius* himselfe write that, as your *Sixtus Senensis* thinketh. For had hee written it, would hee, thinke you, haue vouched his owne authority, and that with such arrogance vnder the name of *Great Athanasius*? or could hee haue mentioned *Gregory Nazianzen*, who flourished so long after his decease? I trow no: yet
Quest. 23. 117. 129. Act. 17. 34. Ib. 16. 3. &c. hee doth both. Secondly, it is well knowne that S. *Paul* was the man that conuerted *Denis*, and that before his comming to *Athens*, *Timothy* had beene entertained by him, and in his company had trauelled ouer many countreyes, and grew so intimate and deere vnto him that he
1 Tim. 1. 2. & 2. c. 1. 2. both counted and called him his Son. Which being so, it cannot reasonably bee imagined that the true *Denis* would proue either so vngratefull or so presumptuous as this counterfait sheweth himselfe to bee: vngratefull, in that forgetting Saint *Paul*, he euer speakes of one *Hierothem*, an obscure man in comparison, as of his Master: presumptuous, for that as if hee were a Father to *Timothy* as well as Saint *Paul* hee calleth him his Sonne, notwithstanding hee were farre more fit to bee his disciple.
Diuin. nom. c. 5. Strom. l. 8. Thirdly, this *Denis* citeth *Clemens the Philosopher*, not *Clemens of Rome* as some would haue it, but of *Alexandria*: for in him the very passage quoted by *Denis* is to
Diuin. nom. c. 4. bee found. And yet this *Clemens* liued two hundred yeeres after Christ. Hee citeth also these words out of

Ignatius,

Ignatius, *My loue is crucified*, as if hee had beene present at his Martyrdome: and yet the true *Dionysius* suffered vnder *Domitian*, whereas *Ignatius* both wrote his Epistle, and was martyred some good while after him vnder *Trajan*. Hee further citeth the Gospell and Reuelation of Saint *Iohn*, as if they had a long time beene parcels of holy Scripture: howbeit (if wee may beleeue history) both those books were written but a little before Saint *Iohns* death, and fourteen yeeres after the death of *Dionysius*. And yet againe, in an Epistle to *Polycarpus* hee speaketh vnto him as vnto a reuerend Bishop and Doctour. Neuertheless *Dionysius* himselfe suffered in *France* in the yeere of our Lord ninety sixe, as Writers testify, but *Polycarpus* in the yeere one hundred sixty sixe, and of his age eighty sixe: so that at the death of *Dionysius*, *Polycarpus* could be but a stripling, and about sixteene yeeres old. Fourthly, according to the Prouerbe, *the Rat perisheth by bewraying himselfe*: for speaking of Infants, and why they are baptized, thus he saith, *Hereof wee say those things which our diuine Maisters being instructed by the old tradition haue brought vnto vs*. In which words ere hee was aware hee hath discouered that not *Paul* nor any other of the Apostles could be his Masters: for it is both vntrue and absurd to say, that the holy Apostles were instructed in the point of *Christian Baptisme by the old tradition*. Lastly, this *Denis* writeth that himselfe together with *Timothy* and *Hierotheus* were present at the departure and funerall of the Blessed Virgin Mother. Now story saith that shee liued three score and three yeeres, being fifteen yeeres of age when she bare Christ, whereunto if yee adde thirty three yeeres of Christs life, and fifteen more to make vp her full age,

Method.

Hier. Eccl. c. 7.

Ep. ad Tim.

it will appeare that shee dyed eight and forty yeeres after her Sonnes birth, and fifteen after his Ascension. But on the other side it plainly appeareth, that *Denis Areopagita* was not converted vnto the Christian Faith till the eighteenth yeere after the ascension, one and fifty yeeres after Christs birth. Our Diuines gather it thus. The Scripture witnesseth that Saint *Paul* was not called till Christ was ascended. Being called, hee stayed three yeeres in *Damascus* and *Arabia* before hee came to *Ierusalem*. Thence he went into the coasts of *Syria* and *Cilicia* and the Countreyes thereabout. And fourteen yeeres after hee came to *Ierusalem* againe with *Barnabas* to the Councell. From the Councell hee went to *Derbe* and *Lystra*, Where hee receiued *Timothy*. And hauing trauelled through *Phrygia*, *Galatia*, *Mysia*, *Macedonia*, hee came at last to *Athens*, where hee conuerted *Denys*. So that it must needs bee about eighteen, or at the least seuenteen yeeres after Christs Ascension before Saint *Denys* knew Christ. All which duely considered, it is euident that the Blessed Virgin dyed if not three full yeeres, yet more then two before the conuersion of *Denys*; and consequently that he could not be one of those Brethren who were present at her death and funerall. Whence also it followeth inuitably, that the Author of that booke cannot possibly be this *Denys*. This argument being pressed by that renowmed *Reinolds* vpon *Iohn Hart*, hee confessed ingenuously that hee knew not how to accord it. And these or the like reasons haue so preuailed with sundry of your owne side, that they haue beene forced some to doubt of him, others vtterly to disclaime him from being the true *Denys*. *Theodorus Gaza* affirmeth those books of the *Hierarchy* to be none

Reinold in Conc. 8. d. 2.
Act. 9. 5.
Gal. 1. 18.
Act. 9. 26.
Gal. 1. 21.
Act. 13. 4.
Gal. 2. 1.
Act. 15. 4.
Act. 16. 1.
Act. 17. 34.
Confer. c. 8. d. 2.
Præf. in Probl. Alex. Aphrod.

of

of *Denys* the *Athenian*. *Erasmus* also professeth himselfe to be of the same mind. And *Laurentius Valla* saith, that the learnedest men of his time entitled one *Apollinarius* vnto them. *Cardinall Cajetan* not onely saith it, but also sheweth how vnlikely it is that hee who wrote of the Names of God, and of the Heauenly and Ecclesiasticall Hierarchy should bee this *Denys*: *Erasmus* further reporteth that one *William Grocin*, an incomparable man both in Diuinity, and all other humane learning, beginning his Lectures in *Pauls* Church in *London*, vpon the bookes of the Heauenly Hierarchy, maintained with great vehemence that it was the worke of *Denys the Areopagite*, wondring at the impudence of them that deuised it. But before he had past halfe way in the worke, he grew to be of another opinion, and freely confessed that it seemed to bee none of this *Denyses*. Finally, *Sixtus Senensis*, although hee professe himselfe to thinke otherwise, yet hee acknowledgeth that not onely *Cajetan*, but diuers others also doubt much whether those bookes bee his whose name they beare. And thus haue I at length fully disengaged my selfe as touching this *Dionysius*, hauing with many vnanswerable argumets maintained the Negatiue I vndertooke against you: which if reason may preuaile with you, and Scripture sufficient to conuince you; if not, yet sufficient to make you stagger. But let vs returne into the lists againe, and resume the argument which we began to vrge.

In Act. 17.
Ibid.
In Act. 17.
In Act. 17.
Biblioth. l. 2. L. 6. a. 22. 9.

Many Counterfaits there are passing vp and downe and masking themselues vnder the names of ancient Fathers. This is confessed of all hands. I demaund then, what infallible rule you haue whereby to discerne, and that without mistaking, which of them are spurious, and

which legitimate. Neither blame mee for demaunding so much, seeing your selues are not afraid to aske vs, how we discerne the Gospell of S. *Matthew* to be Canonicall rather then that of *Nicodemus*. Whereunto if I should answer with you, that the Church hath resolued vpon the Canon of Scripture: can you returne the like answer vpto my demand that the Church hath agreed vpon a Canon for the Fathers also? If you cannot, as I know you neither can nor will, what further security I pray haue you? Is it your owne iudgement? But I haue already shewed you, both in *Dionysius Areopagita*, and *Athanasius*, how much that hath deceiued you. And not to flatter you, I suppose you haue not so throughly attended and studied this point, but that many other of these *Counterfaits* by bearing the name of the *Fathers*, may bee entertained by you as the very Fathers themselues. Is it then the iudgement of other learned men? Alas they are distracted among themselues, and one admitteth that whom another reiecteth. For example, the *Constitutions of Clemens*, saith *Stapleton*, *is a booke full of Apostolicall spirit*: yet saith *Baronius*, *it is reckoned among those that are Apocryphall*. Againe, *Eckius* voucheth *Cyprians de Cena Domini for Transubstantiation*: but *Bellarmine* denieth that booke to bee *Cyprians*. The *Iesuites* of *Rhemes* also cite the *Commentaries* of *Ambrose* vpon the Epistles for the Popes supremacie: yet *Bellarmine* holdeth it was neither written by *Ambrose*, nor any Catholicke. *Cardinall Allen* alledgeth *Hierome* on the Prouerbs for Purgatory: but *Sixtus Senensis* denies those Commentaries to be *Hieromes*. Finally, for I will only giue you a taste, *Suarez* quoteth *Augustin ad fratres in eremo* for *Suffrages*: but the *Censors of Louan* tell him plainely

De author. Ec. l. 2. c. 11. Hist. tom. 2. p. 15.

Enchir. tract. de Euch.

De Euchar. l. 2. c. 9.

In 1. Tim. 3.

De Euchar. l. 2. c. 14.

Of Purg. l. 9. L. 4. tit. Hier.

Tom. 4. d. 45. S. 1. n. 30.

plainely that it is a counterfait booke. Beſides this, if you will needs truſt the iudgement of others herein, perhaps when you thinke you heare a Father ſpeake you may bee pitifully deceiued. For whether it bee out of ignorance, or retchleſneſſe, or ſet purpoſe to beguile, I cannot tell: but ſure I am it is moſt vſuall and ordinary in all Popiſh writers to quote for *Fathers* thoſe that are not *Fathers* and of ancient credit, but I know not what *Foundlings* and *Changelings borne in Fairie land*, and yeſterday or three dayes agoe brought amongſt vs. What adooe keepeth *Maſter Harding* with his *Amphilochius*, *Abdias*, *Leontius*, *Martialis*, *Hippolytus*, *Simeon Metaphraſtes*, and other ſuch knights of the poſte? What a rumble doe others make with the Epiſtles of *Clemens*, *Euariſtus*, *Teleſphorus*, *Hyginus*, *Aniceius*, *Soter*, *Calixtus*, *Vrbanus*, *Pontianus*, *Anterus*, *Fabianus* and the like, the barbarouſneſſe of whoſe ſtile bewrayes, that they were written rather by ſome illeterate clerke then learned Biſhop. But aboue all I cannot ſufficiently wonder at *Doctor Briſtow*, and the whole *Colledge* of *Rhemes*, who knowing that of the twelue books which *Cyril* of *Alexandria* wrote vpon *Iohn*, foure are periſhed, namely the fift, ſixt, ſeuenth, and eigth, and that one *Iodocus Clichtoueus* a muſhrom of yeſternight ſupplied them out of his owne braine: yet cite theſe books of *Clichtoueus* againe and againe, and that vnder the name of Saint *Cyril* himſelfe. And this you may pleaſe to bee aduertiſed of by way of Caueat alſo, becauſe, as it ſeemed in our Conference, you often read Saint *Cyril* and peruſe him. To vrge this point no further I conclude, ſeeing you are not any way infallibly certaine which are the writings of the Fathers, which not, and the ground of Faith muſt be

Def. of Alleg. Purg. In Pref. & in Ioh. 10, 29. & Heb. 10, 26.

that which is infallibly certaine, you cannot safely build vpon consent of Fathers, vnlesse you will build vpon vncertainty.

But suppose there were no doubt at all of their writings, which they bee: yet you cannot with any security rest vpon them, vnlesse you are in like manner certaine, that after so many ages they still retaine their natiue purity, and are come to your hands without any corruption. But such certainty you can haue none: for all the world knowes how shamefully the Fathers haue beene abused, and how intolerably corrupted, and that both of old and of late also. *Vincentius Lirinensis* saith, that diuers of the ancients thought, the works of *Origen* had beene miserably depraued. *Bellarmine* sayth, *it is very credible many blasphemies were inserted into them by Hereticks.* And *Sixtus Senensis*, *that they had defiled all his works with innumerable Heresies.* Pope *Leo* much grieued that his Epistles had beene polluted with the vnwashen hands of Hereticks. And the *Recognitions* of *Clemens* were by them also corrupted, sayth *Ruffin.* *It is manifest also*, saith *Sixtus Senensis*, that the Canons *of the Apostles were contaminated by the Nicolaitans.* And, the imperfect worke of *Chrysostome* vpon *Mathew*, abounds with sundry strange monsters of Heretiks. The same *Sixtus* further sayth, that *Pamphilus Martyr*, *Eusebius Cæsariens*, *Didymus*, and *Ruffinus* much complained, that very many writings not only of *Clemens*, *Dionysius*, *Origen*, and *Athanasius*, but of other noble Doctors also were pitifully handled by Heretiks. *Erasmus* not onely complaines that many things were foysted in by others into the middle of treatises, as namely of *Athanasius*, *Chrysostome*, *Hierome*, *Basil*, others: but expresly

Cap. 23. De Christo l. 1. c. 10.
L. 4. tit. Orig.
Id. ib. tit. Leo.
Id. tit. Clem.
Id. ibid. l. 2.
Tit. Iohan. Chrysost.
Præfat. in l. 5.
Pref in Basil. de Sp. S.

preſly affirmeth that the Friers are they who haue corrupted the Fathers. Not ſo expreſly *Ludouicus vines*, yet couertly hee inſinuates as much, *In this chapter of Auguſtin*, ſaith he, *many things are added by thoſe who with their polluted hands haue defiled the writings of great Authors.* Euen of late *Pamelius*, although eight other written copies failed him, yet bashed not vpon the ſole authority of one blind *Cambron* copie, to inſert into *Cyprian, de unitate Eccleſiæ*, theſe words, *He that forſaketh the chaire of Peter on which the Church is founded, doth hee hope himſelfe to be in the Church?* Which gloſſeme notwithſtanding it bee not to bee found nor in *Alopecius* his print, nor in that of *Heruagius*, or *Langlier*, or *Crinitus*, or *Gryphius*, or *Manutius*, or any other, no not in any other written copie, as our learned *Bilſon* ſheweth: yet becauſe it ſeemeth to make much for the authority of the See of *Rome*, it muſt of neceſſity bee clapt into the text. Whereas contrarily, if all the Copies of the *Imperfect worke vpon Mathew* haue in them theſe words, *In which not the true Body of Chriſt, but the Sacrament of his Body is contained*; becauſe it maketh ſtrongly againſt Tranſubſtantiation, it muſt needs bee inforced (for ſo it pleaſeth *Bellarmins* grace) by ſome Scholler of *Berengarius*. And as the Fathers haue been not a little wronged by way of addition, ſo I feare mee they haue receiued much iniury alſo by way of Subtraction. *We haue taken order*, ſaith *Sixtus Senenſis* vnto Pope *Pius* the fift, *that all the works of Catholicke writers, and ſpecially the ancient Fathers ſhould bee purged and corrected.* In *Cyprians* works printed at *Rome* by *Manutius*, the letter of *Firmilianus* B. of *Cæſaria* is left out. Why? but becauſe hee is in ſomewhat quicke againſt *Steuen* B. of *Rome*. In regard

In Ciuit. Dei l. 22. c. 8.

Part. 2. p. 89.

De Euchar. l. 2. c. 22.

Ep. dedic.

regard whereof saith *Pamelius*, it had beene more wisdome if it neuer had beene set out. The works of *Ambrose* also set foorth by *Frelonius* at *Lions* were before the printing of them razed by two Friers. This *Fr. Iunius* saw with his eyes, and the Corrector of the presse complayned of it, professing hee would buy any other print rather then that. You must needs bee very deafe, for all the world rings of it, if you haue not heard of the late order taken amongst you for the purging of bookes at the next reprinting of them: namely that whatsoeuer is to be found whether in the *Epistle Dedicatory*, or *Preface*, or *Margent*, or *Tables*, or *Annotations*, or in the *Text of the worke* it selfe, any way seeming to make either against them, or for vs, be wholy cut off, and left out in the next edition. Then which I thinke there was neuer a more base and beggerly shift vsed. Neither doth it argue other then the badnesse of your cause, and the distrust you haue of it: for truth and a good cause would much disdaine to bee supported by so vniust, and dishonest meanes. Yet is this policy now a principall pillar of your Religion, and hath of late yeeres beene carefully executed. Witnesse those *Expurgatorie Indices* which giue direction to the Ouersees of this businesse, what is to bee altered, which to be added, and what to bee defalked and spunged out: of which fiue are published to the world, one printed in *Flanders*, a second in *Spayne*, a third in *Portugal*, a fourth in *Naples*, a fift in *Rome*. What others there be lurking in secret and not yet come to light I know not. Witnesse also the writings of *Cardinall Cajetan, Polydor Virgil, Andreas Masius, Feras, Ludouicus Viues, Erasmus, Beatus Rhenanus*, and innumerable others which haue already passed this *Purgatory*,

gatory, and are not set forth pitifully mangled and dismembred. But to leaue this, suppose the Fathers haue not been so shamefully entreated, as I haue shewed: yet would I pray you to answer mee these two questions, the first, whether you bee assured of this consent by your own reading, or else beleiue it vpon the report of others: the second, if you haue read them all your owne selfe, whether you haue read them in a translation, or in their owne originall language. To the first of these two questions, I presume you neither can nor will answer that you haue read them all your selfe: for I know you neither haue them all, nor haue you had sufficient either time or strength to peruse them all, vnlesse happily your body bee made of yron, and you haue reached vnto the yeares of *Methuselah*. What then? will you trust the allegations of other men? Take heed what you doe, for so you may soone bee deceiued. For example, *Stapleton* to proue that *Paul* was the Apostle of the Gentiles, but *Peter* both of Iewes and Gentiles, alledgeth these words of *Ambrose*, *Hee nameth Peter alone and compareth him to himselfe, because hee had receiued the Primacy to build the Church, that himselfe likewise is chosen to haue the Primacy of building the Churches of the Gentiles: yet so that Peter preached vnto the Gentiles also.* Here your Doctor stops, and *Iohn Hart* taking it vp vpon trust, vrgeth it against *Reynolds* as a strong testimony: whereas *Ambrose*, if yee curtall not his words, saith cleane otherwise, thus, yet so that *Peter* also *preached to the Gentiles if it were needfull, and Paul to the Iewes.* Many mo such falsifications might I easily produce out of your writers: but let vs rather heare how themselues censure one another. *Antony Augustin* Archbishop of *Tarrason* desi-

1. 2. #

Doct. Princ. 6. c. 14.

In Gal.

/.

ring in a booke written to that purpose that *Gratian.* might bee purged, saith, *His faults are so many that they cannot bee reckoned in one day. For hee alledgeth false Authors ascribing words to Gregory, Ambrose, Augustin no whore to bee found in them: and produceth true Authors, but so as oft times he bringeth in contrary sentences.* Cumel saith that *the testimony of Hierome is by Molina, Suares, and others fraudulently cited:* and that *Suares* alledging *Chrysostome, cuts off that which immediatly goes before and followes after; because hee saw Chrysostome fauoured not his opinion at all. It is no rare thing,* saith *Iohannes Marsilius, for his illustrious Lordship, meaning Bellarmine, to cite Authors for an opinion, whereas they affirme the plaine contrary.* And againe, *It grieueth mee to see things imputed vnto holy Fathers, the contrary whereof they affirme.* Finally saith the foresayd *Marsilius* touching *Cardinall Baronius, I haue heard that as hee hath taken a liberty to mend the Fathers, Canons, and Historians, so he will correct the Councels after his manner, and for the same purpose, and to assume vnto himselfe a licence herein, which God forbid.* And thus you see euen by your owne men how dangerous it is to trust them in their allegations. As for the second question, I thinke you will confesse (pardon mee if I thinke amisse) that you haue not skill enough with vnderstanding to read the *Greeke Fathers* in their *Original*, but are faine to trust vnto *Translations.* But I beseech you doe not *Translators* many times what through ignorance, or negligence, or wilfulnesse mistake and peruert the meaning of their Author? *Ruffinus* translated the *Ecclesiasticall history* of *Eusebius*, and in it this passage of *Clemens*, that *Peter*, *Iames*, and *Iohn*, *although Christ preferred them almost before all, yet they*

De emend. Grat. l. 1. dial. 1.

Disp. Var. to. 3. p. 126. Pag. 124.

Defens. p. 324.

Pag. 289.

Ib. p. 357.

l. 2. c. 1.

they tooke not the honour of Primacy to themselues, but ordained Iames who was surnamed Iust Bishop of the Apostles. A shrewd testimony for the Primacy of *Iames* against that of *Peter*: but the error is in the translation, the *Greeke Eusebius* hauing not *Bishop of the Apostles*, but *Bishop of Hierusalem*. Yet *Marianus Scotus* citeth the same out of *Methodius* iust according to *Ruffins* translation, from whence perhaps it was taken. *Eusebius* himselfe in expresse termes affirmeth the Epistle of S. *Iames* to be Spurious: but your *Chrystopherson* renders it so, as if he had meant that not himselfe but some others in the Church had so esteemed it in former times. And lastly, not to stand longer vpon this point, that very translation of *Cyrillus Alexandrinus* which you haue, made by *Trapezuntius*, you haue little reason much to trust vnto. For as *Bonauentura Vulcanius* sheweth, it is a very disorderly one, wherein many things are omitted, much is added of his owne, and much peruersly translated. To conclude therefore, seeing the writings of the Fathers haue so many wayes and so notoriously beene abused, by addition, by subtraction, by alteration, by misquotation, by mistranslation: it followeth that infallible certainty from them you can haue none, and so consequently that you cannot safely build your Faith vpon them.

Hist. l. 2. c. 23.

Præf. & Ann.

To proceed, the Scriptures you say are obscure and ambiguous, and therefore you may not rest vpon them saue onely as they are expounded of the Fathers. If so, then if the Fathers also bee obscure and ambiguous, neither may you rest your Faith vpon them. Now certainly the Fathers are as darke and doubtfull as the Scripture. If you thinke otherwise, doe but read the works

of *Tertullian* and *Arnobius*, and let me afterward know your minde. For my part I ſee no reaſon why the Scripture ſhould bee more ſubiect to diuerſity of interpretations according to the difference of times, as *Cardinall Cuſan* impiouſly affirmeth, and *Dureus* the Ieſuit impudently defendeth; then the writings of the Fathers. What? doe wee not vouch the Fathers on both ſides? are we not as confident vpon them as you? whence commeth this, I beſeech you, if they bee ſo cleere that no doubt can bee made of them? And why doe you profeſſe in your *Flemiſh Expurgatorie Index*, that *in ancient Catholike Writers, yee tolerate many errors, yee extenuate and excuſe them, and often deny them by deuiſing ſome ſhift, and faining a ſence vnto them when they are oppoſed againſt you?* What need I ſay, all theſe tricks and fetches if there bee no obſcurity in them? If literall and Grammaticall conſtruction may cary it, the Fathers are directly ours: and wee ſuppoſe they ment as they wrote, neither can you make any ſhew of anſwer, vnleſſe you fall to expound the meaning of them. And ſo as you remoue your Faith from the letter of the Scripture vnto the expoſition of the Fathers: ſo muſt you of force remoue the ſame againe from the letter of the Fathers vnto ſome other tribunall to determine the ſence and meaning thereof. Giue mee leaue to declare this by ſome few examples. That *Faith only iuſtifies*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Euſebius Cæſarienſis*, *Hilary*, *Baſil*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtin*, *Cyril*, *Primaſius*, *Heſychius*, *Gennadius*, *Oecumenius*, in expreſſe tearmes affirme, agreeing therein with vs: whoſe words I will not fayle to produce whenſoeuer you ſhall require. Againſt hauing of Images in Churches, and the Adoration of them, wee haue

Ep. 2. & 7. Cont. Whit. l. 2. p. 45.

haue the preciſe words not onely of *Lactantius* and *Epiphanius* and other *Fathers* ſeuerally, but nineteene Biſhops together in the Councell of *Eliberis*, and of the whole Councell of *Frankford* vnder *Charles the Great*. Epiſt. ad Iob. Hieroſol.

Againſt the Biſhop of *Romes ſupremacy* wee haue the plaine reſolution of *Pope Gregory*, *that he is the forerunner of Antichriſt whoſoeuer deſires to bee called Vniuerſall Biſhop*. And of the Generall Councell of *Chalcedon*, giuing to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* equall priuiledges with the Biſhop of *Rome*. And of two hundred & ſeuenteene Biſhops in the firſt Councell of *Carthage*, among whom were Saint *Auguſtin*, *Proſper*, *Oroſius*, and many other worthy Fathers, all decreeing that the *Pope of Rome* thenceforward ſhould haue no authority ouer the *African Churches*. Finally, againſt *Tranſubſtantiation* thus writeth *Gelaſius*, himſelfe a Biſhop of *Rome*, *The Sacraments of the Body and Bloud of* CHRIST *which we receiue is a diuine thing, wherefore by them wee are made partakers of the diuine nature, and yet the ſubſtance of bread and wine ceaſeth not to bee.* Thus alſo *Theodoret*, *Hee who hath called meat and drinke that which naturally is his body, and after cals himſelfe a Vine, he himſelfe hath honoured the viſible ſignes with the name of his Body and Bloud, hauing not changed their nature, but hauing added grace vnto nature.* And againe, *The ſignes myſticall change not their nature after conſecration, for they remaine in their firſt ſubſtance, figure and forme.* *Chryſoſtome* likewiſe, if hee bee the Authour of the imperfect worke on *Matth.* *In the ſacred veſſels there is not the true Body of* CHRIST, *but the myſtery of his Body.* And Saint *Auguſtin*, *The Lord doubted not to ſay, This is my Body, when he gaue the ſigne of his Body.* Thus the Fathers in

Lib. 6. ep. 30.

Act. 16.

Dedinab. nat. con. Eutych.

Dial. 1.

Dial. 10.

Hom. 28.

Con. Adimant. c. 12.

these few points: neither is it hard to shew the like confusion in the rest. What? Will you now subscribe vnto their words, vnderstanding them in the right sense, But who shall iudge of this? for you vnderstand them one way, we another. Shall the learned *Rabbies* of your side? Fie, that were too partiall: and they so enterfere in their answers that they cut and hew one the other miserably. Reuerend Bishop *Morton* hath demonstrated this at large. Take one of his examples. *The Councell of Eliberis forbidderh the having of Images in Churches, and Adoration of them. Of Images representing Gods nature*, saith *Andradius*. *No*, saith *Bellarmine*, *for such were not then in vse. Fairy scarce it be Credible, should thinke Christians worshipped them idolatrously*, saith *Sanders*. But the reason of the Canon agreeth not much with this exposition, saith *Bellarmine*. Because Christians seemed to worship those Images as Gods, saith *Alan Cope*. But this exposition is not agreeable to the Canon, saith *Bellarmine*. Lest in time of persecution they should be made a scorne and contempt vnto infidels, saith *Sanders*, *Allen*, *Tarnius*, and *Bellarmine*. But this exposition agreeth not with the intention of the Canon, saith *Vasques*. Lest by the decay of the wals they might loose their lustre, saith the same *Vasques*. The Councell was but prouinciall, and neuer confirmed by the Pope, say diuerse of late, being oppressed with the obiection. But *Baronius* and *Binius* affirme that it was a lawfull Councell and free from errour. And whatsoeuer the occasion of the prohibition was, this is sure, *The Councell of Eliberis did absolutely forbid the worship of images*, saith *Sixtus Senensis*. What say you now to this language of *Babel*? Can you gather any certainty for your Faith out of such confusion?

Preamble ag. Mitigator.

Do Imagin. l. 2. c. 9.

Ibid.

Ibid.

De adorat. l. 2. d. 5. c. 2. n. 131.

Ib. n. 132.

Ib. n. 122.

Bell. Imag. l. 2. c. 36.

Bin. de Conc. in hunc Can.

Biblioth. l. 5. ann. 247.

Certenly

Certainly you cannot. And if many Fathers laying their heads together in a generall Councell, may giue in their decrees of Faith vpon inconuenient speech either by superfluity of clearnes, or disorderly placing them, and the like; for many vnlearned Readers are to be considered by you. *Bellarmine* affirmeth it, and your chiefe reason why some few of them writing seuerally, one from another, may not also faile in their clearnes, and thereby leaue the Readers mind in suspence and doubt what their true meaning should bee? This very Synode of *Trent* hath not spoken so plainely, but that it hath left scruples in the mind of some. And yet, *Good God*, saith *Campian*, *what variety of Nations, what choice of Ships out of the whole world, what Nursery of Kings and States, what marow of Diuines, what holynesse, what teares, what fasting, what flowers of Vniuersities, what tongues, what subtilty, what eloquence, what infinite reading, what riches of sentences and studies Iroplenished than more then humane Sanctuary?* All which notwithstanding *Bellarmine* and *Sixtus Senensis* accord not in the meaning of the third Session touching the number of the Canonicall bookes. For *Bellarmine* thinks that the seuen last chapters of *Hester* following after the tenth are by the Councell admitted into the Canon, but *Sixtus* thinketh no. Neither yet are *Bellarmine* and *Ambrose Catharin* agreed about the eleuenth Canon of the seuenth Session concerning the necessity of the Priests intention to make a Sacrament, the one affirming it, the other denying it. Nor lastly, are they resolued of the Councels mind touching *Originall sinne*, *Catharin*, who had beene in the Councell a great stickler, defining it only by the Imputation of *Adams* sinne, others affirming it to bee

De Concil. l. 2. c. 12.

Ed. Rat. 4.

De verb. Dei. l. 1. c. 7.

Biblioth. l. 1. & 8.

De Sacram. in gen. l. 2. c. 25.

Opusc. de intent. minist.

Ib. de lapsi. & pecc. or. c. 6.

Bell. de amiss. grat. l. 5. c. 16.

be more then so, and that vpon the words of the Councell too. I could easily instance in sundry other points: but these are enough to let you see, that the Oracles of *Lorica* were [illegible] more perplexe, then the Decrees of this *Tridentine* conuenticle. Whether they were framed so of purpose, or no, I cannot tell, many shrewdly suspect it. Sure I am, it hath beene so farre from stinting of quarels, that in many things it hath beene and still is the matter and fewell of contention. Howsoeuer, seeing the Fathers oftentimes write so darkly and ambiguously, that there is great doubt made not onely betweene you and vs, but amongst your chiefest Doctors also, what their right meaning should bee: I conclude, and that according to your own rule, that Consent of Fathers cannot bee a sufficient ground to build vpon.

But what if the more part of Fathers consent in error, euen in those points which the Church of *Rome* herselfe condemneth? Will you not then freely confesse that such Consent is not so firme and sure a ground as you tooke it to bee? Doubtlesse you will, vnlesse you be too too wilfull and obstinate in your opinion. Let vs therefore a little examine this point. That Christ after the first Resurrection shall liue with his elect hereupon earth for a thousand yeeres in all peace and happynesse vntill the second Resurrection, is the error of the *Millenaries*, and iustly condemned by the Church of *Rome*. Yet *Papias Saint Iohn the Apostles auditor*, *Apollinarius*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullianus*, *Victorinus Pitabionensis*, *Lactantius*, *Seuerus Sulpitius*, *Iustin Martyr*, and a great multitude of other Catholicke men were of the same opinion, all being deceiued by misunderstanding that in the Reuelation, *And they shall raigne with him a thousand yeeres*. *S. Augustin*

Sixt. Senens. l. 5. ann. 133. & 6. ann. 347.

Auguſtin ſpeaketh very tenderly of it, calling it neither error nor hereſy, himſelfe hauing ſometimes held it. And *Hierome* durſt not condemne it, becauſe ſo many Church-men and Martyrs had ſaid it. That the ſoules of iuſt men after their diſſolution ſee not the face of God vntill the day of iudgement, is an error and condemned by the Church of *Rome*. Yet the Liturgie fathered vpon *Saint Iames*, *Irenæus*, *Iuſtin*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Origen*, *Lactantius*, *Victorinus Martyr*, *Prudentius*, *Ambroſe*, *Chryſoſtome*, the Author of the Vnperfect worke on *Mathew*, *Auguſtin*, *Theodoret*, *Arethas*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact*, *Euthymius*, *Pope Iohn* the two and twentieth, and *Bernard*, held the ſame, whoſe particular words *Sixtus Senenſis* recordeth in his Library. I am not ignorant how *Sixtus* there labour'th to excuſe them: but others of his owne followers find their words ſo pregnant that they can by no meanes ſalue them. That the thrice bleſſed Virgin Mary was conceiued in Originall Sinne, the Church of *Rome* holdeth to be an error: for not onely the vnskilfull vulgar, but the Doctors and Diuines, and all Catholiks with one conſent fight for the Immaculate Conception, ſaith *Vaſques*. And why hath your Church by her authority commanded the feaſt of our Conception to bee celebrated, vnleſſe ſhee were conceiued without ſinne? Yea Cardinall *Turrecremata* affirmes, that all the Doctors in a manner maintaine the contrary, and that hee had gathered together the teſtimonies of three hundred to that effect, noting the very places and words wherein they affirme it. And *Dominicus Bannes* ſaith, that it is the *generall conſent of the holy Doctors, that ſhee was conceiued in ſinne: and yet the contrary is held in the Church, to be not onely probable, but*

De ciuit. Dei l. 20. c. 25.

In Ier. l. 4.

2.

Lib. 6. annot. 345.

Stapl. de auth. Sc. l. 11. c. 2.

3.

3. d. 117. n. 148.

De conſecr. d. 4. Firmiſſime n. 11.

Part. 1. q. 1. d. 5.

very godly. That Angels and the Soules of men are bodily, visible, and circumscriptible, is an error, and condemned by the Church of *Rome.* Yet three hundred Fathers, such as they were, and fifty vpon the head of them, in the second Councell of *Nice*, auouch it, and alledge the authority of *Basil* surnamed the *Great*, Blessed *Athanasius*, *Theodosius*, and their followers for it. If any shall say, it was the opinion onely of *Iohn* B. of *Thessalonica*, and not of the whole Councell: I answer, that what *Iohn* said, *Thurisius Patriarch of Constantinople*, forthwith confirmed, and the whole *Synod* immediatly answered, So it is my Lord. And this is so cleere, that *Bartholmew Carranza* notes it as an errour in them, and contrary vnto the *Lateran Councell*: yet addes withall that Saint *Augustin* was of the same mind. But leauing other their errors, I come without further delay to discharge that obligation, wherein I stand bound to proue, that the Fathers for a time generally held it necessary for all, euen young Infants, to bee partakers of the Eucharist, or they could not bee saued: which you know the Church of *Rome* alloweth not, but condemneth as an error.

Actionc. &c.

Epit. Conc. ad cum loc. Ep. 215. De Eccl. dog. c. 11. & 12.

Conc. Trid. Sess. 5. can. 4.

First your *Denys*, hee that goeth vnder the name of *Areopagita*, after hee hath recited other ceremonies in the administration of Baptisme, *at length*, saith hee, *the Priest cals the partie Baptized to the most holy Eucharist, and giues the Communion vnto him.* And lest you should vnderstand this of them that are baptized being *Adulti*, elsewhere he speaketh more plainely thus, *That children who cannot yet vnderstand diuine things should bee made partakers of holy Baptisme, and of the mysticall signes of the most holy Communion, may perhaps seeme ridiculous.*

Eccl. hier. c. 2. P. 3.

Id. 7. c. 3.

ridiculous to prefane men, if the Auditors when Biſhops teach ſuch Heauenly things bee not fit. Saint *Cyprian* re- De lapſis.
ports a ſtory of a certaine Infant mayde, who had not yet age enough to tell what wrong another had done her, how when the Deacon had offered the holy chalice vnto her, and ſhee refuſed, hee powred it into her mouth. And a little after, *Will not thoſe Infants*, ſaith hee, *when* Ibid.
the day of iudgement ſhall come, ſay, wee haue done nothing, neither forſaking the meat and cup of the Lord haue wee of our owne accord haſtned to theſe profane contagions: the perfidiouſneſſe of others hath ouerthrowne vs, our Parents are our murtherers. *Innocent* the firſt B. of *Rome*, *That* Ep. ad Patr. conc. Milou.
which your *Brotherhood*, ſaith hee, *affirmeth them to preach, namely that little ones may obtaine the reward of eternall life without the grace of Baptiſme is very fooliſh: for vnleſſe they eat the fleſh of the Sonne of man and drinke his blood, they cannot haue life in them.* Of this *Innocen-* Con. Iul. Pel. l. 1. c. 2.
tius S. *Auguſtin* ſaith, *how hee defined, that little ones vnleſſe they did eat the fleſh of the Sonne of man, they could by no meanes haue life in them.* Now I beſeech you durſt any man at that time hold otherwiſe then the head of the Church (for ſo you count the Pope to bee) had defined? But let vs heare Saint *Auguſtin* himſelfe. *Verily*, Con. duas Ep.
ſaith he, *Chriſt is the Sauiour of little ones alſo, and vnleſſe* Pel. l. 1. c. 22.
they bee redeemed by him, they muſt periſh: becauſe without his fleſh and blood they cannot haue life. And againe, *Wherefore they alſo, as I haue ſaid, if they die in that ten-* Ad vital. Ep.
der age, ſhall certainly bee iudged, according to the things 107.
they haue done by the Body, namely during that time while they liued in the body, when by the heart and mouth of them that bare them they beleiued or not beleiued, when they were baptized or not baptized, when they ate the fleſh of

Chriſt, or not ate it, when alſo they drinke his bloud or not drunke it? According to theſe things I ſay which they haue done by the body, not thoſe which they would haue done had they liued longer here ſhall they bee iudged. And yet a-
De pec. mer. & remiſſ. l. 1. c. 20. gaine, *Away therefore now with doubting, Let vs heare the Lord and not the ſuſpicions and coniectures of men, let vs I ſay heare the Lord ſpeaking this not of the Sacrament of Baptiſme, but of the Sacrament of his holy Table, to which none lawfully approcheth but hee that is Baptized, Vnleſſe you eat my Fleſh and drinke my Bloud you ſhall haue no life in you. What ſeeke wee further? What will they bee able to anſwer hereunto, vnleſſe obſtinacy doe ſtretch their ſtriuing ſinewes againſt the conſtancy of euident truth? Will any dare to ſay this alſo, that this ſaying belongs not vnto little ones, or that they may haue life in them without the participation of this Body and Bloud, becauſe hee ſaith not, hee that eateth not, as of Baptiſme, hee that is not borne againe, but thus, If yee eat not, as ſpeaking to them who were able to heare and vnderſtand which certainly little ones cannot? But hee that ſaith ſo, marketh not that vnleſſe this ſaying hold all, that they cannot haue life without the Body and Blood of the Sonne of Man, euen the elder age alſo will make little reckoning of it.* And
Ib. c. 24. yet once more againe, *The Carthaginian Chriſtians excellently call Baptiſme no other then Saluation, and the Sacrament of the Body of Chriſt no other then Life. Whence but from an ancient and as I thinke Apoſtolicall tradition, by which the Churches of Chriſt hold as ingrafted into them that without Baptiſme and the participation of the Lords Table no man can come not onely to the Kingdome of God, but neither to ſaluation nor life eternall.* And this being thus proued, by and by he concludes, *If therefore*

as ſo many and ſo pregnant diuine teſtimonies witneſſe with ioint conſent, no man may hope either for ſaluation or eternall life without Baptiſme and the Body and Blood of the Lord, in vaine doe they promiſe it to little ones without them. Thus *Auguſtin*: where by the way obſerue how hee affirmeth this his opinion to bee the Tenet of all the Churches of Chriſt. To whom I adde laſtly the eleuenth Councell of *Toledo*, *If any faithfull man being conſtrained by any inceuitable infirmity ſhall caſt vp the Euchariſt which hee hath receiued, let him in no caſe bee ſubiect to Eccleſiaſticall condemnation. Likewiſe let not the cenſure of any condemne them, who either in the time of their infancy ſhall doe the ſame, or in the alienation of their mind, ſeeming to bee ignorant of what they doe.* This error touching the neceſſity of the Euchariſt to Infants continued in the Church a long time, euen about ſixe hundred yeeres, as your *Maldonat* faith. And *Beatus Rhenanus* obſeruеth out of the Rituall books called *Agendæ*, that the cuſtome of miniſtring the Communion to Infants was ſtill in vſe vnto the times of *Ludouicus Pius* and *Lotharius*, that is, towards nine hundred yeeres after Chriſt. Againſt all this I know not what can be ſaid, vnleſſe perhaps, that it might bee a generall cuſtome, but not a generall opinion. and ſo indeed ſome of your men turne it off, and the Councell of *Trent* ſaith, *that as thoſe holy Fathers had probable cauſe of their doing according to the reaſon of the time, ſo without controuerſie muſt we beliеue that they did it not vpon neceſſity of ſaluation.* But firſt, this is a queſtion not of Faith but of Fact, namely what thoſe Fathers did beliеue in this point: and in a matter of Fact your ſelues confeſſe a Councell may bee deceiued. Secondly, the ſayings aboue related are ſo plaine

Can. 11.

In Ioh. 6. 53. In Tertull. de cor. mill.

and expreſſe as none can bee more: ſo that it muſt needs bee extreme madneſſe to yeeld vnto this conſequent, the Councell of *Trent*, that is, a few men of yeſterday ſay ſo, and therefore though Pope *Innocent*, and *Auguſtin*, and other of the ancient Fathers ſay the contrary of themſelues, yet muſt wee not belieue them. Thirdly, the very Text of Scripture which they alledged to proue their opinion, vnderſtanding it of the Euchariſt as they did, manifeſtly argues they held a neceſſity of it to Infants, *Vnleſſe you eat the fleſh of the Son of Man and drinke his blood yee ſhall not haue life in you.* Laſtly, you are to know that the Fathers brought in this of the Euchariſt againſt the Pelagians to proue the neceſſity of Baptiſme, thus, None can bee ſaued without partaking of the holy Communion: None may partake of the holy Communion except hee bee Baptized, *Ergo*, none can bee ſaued except hee bee Baptized. The Aſſumption they tooke for granted: the Maior they warranted by the aforeſaid text. So that the Concluſion muſt of neceſſity fall to the ground, and Baptiſme cannot bee neceſſary vnleſſe the Euchariſt alſo bee neceſſary. And thus haue I diſcharged this obligation alſo, and haue made good my promiſe vnto you as touching this point. From which together with the other particulars aboue mentioned, I conclude, that the Fathers haue generally erred, and conſequently that Conſent of Fathers cannot bee a ground of Faith, vnleſſe you will conſent with them in error.

Which will yet further appeare, if you will pleaſe to take notice that your own men orderly reiect them notwithſtanding their Conſent. For why ſhould they doe thus after ſo many vaunts and brags, if they thought the more

more part of them could not erre? Yet that ſo they doe, learne by theſe few examples. *Canus* ſaith that from that place of the Apoſtle, *In whom haue all ſinned*, all the holy Fathers with one mouth affirme the Bleſſed Virgin to haue beene conceiued in *Originall ſinne*, as namely *Chryſoſtome, Euſebius, Remigius, Ambroſe, Auguſtin, Bernard, Bede, Anſelme, Erardus Martyr, S. Antony, Bonauenture, Aquinas, Vincentius, Damaſcenus, Hugo de ſancto Victore.* Yet, ſaith hee, *though there were no Author to ſtand againſt them, the argument drawne from conſent of all the Fathers is but weake, and the contrary opinion is more probably and piouſly defended.* *Salmeron* alſo beeing hardly beſet with the ſame army of Fathers in the ſame point, quits himſelfe like a man thus, *To this multitude of Doctors we oppoſe another multitude, to driue out one naile with another*: his meaning is, the learned men of theſe latter times againſt the Ancient Fathers. *Michael Medina* confeſſeth that *Hierome, Ambroſe, Auguſtin, Sedulius, Primaſius, Chryſoſtome, Theodoret, Oecumenius*, and *Theophylact*, to whom hee might haue added diuers others, that I ſay they held there was no difference betweene a Presbyter and a Biſhop: yet hee reiecteth it as the opinion of the Heretike *Aërius*. That Chriſt is the true Shepheard mentioned in the tenth of *Iohn*, *Auguſtin, Chryſoſtome, Hierome, Cæſarius, Cyril, Theodoret, Aponius, Gregorius Rom. Anaſtaſius Sinaita, Proſper, Theophylact, Euthymius, Rupertus, Cyprian, Leontius, Eucherius Lugd. Bede, Bernard, Anſelme Cantuar. Liranus*, and many others affirme: yet, ſaith *Stapleton*, the *Pope* is vnderſtood thereby. All the Ancient Fathers in a manner, as *Gregory Nazianzen, Origen, Athanaſius*, the Author of the imperfect worke on *Mathem.*, Saint

Loc. l. 7. c. 1. n. 1.

Rom. 5.

In Rom. 5. d. 51.

De Sacr. hom. orig. l. 1. c. 5.

Annid. Euang. in Ioh. 10.

Saint *Ambroſe*, Saint *Hierome*, and generally all the ancient Hebrewes, as both *Ioſephus* and *Philo* teſtifie, diuided the *Decalogue* as wee doe, making the firſt table to conſiſt of foure Commandements concerning Gods worſhip, and that againſt Images to bee the ſecond: your Church notwithſtanding to couer her ſpirituall fornications, and the ſacrilegious razing of that Commandement out of your Prayer-books and Catechiſmes, goes againſt all antiquity, diuiding the firſt table onely into three Commandements, and cutting the tenth into two, hauing no other colour for it but onely one *Auguſtins* ſingle authority. To bee breefe, In the expoſition of this verſe, ſaith *Tolet, nor the Greeks, nor the Latins, nor they who follow the Hebrewes, ſeeme to mee to ſpeake perfectly. So almoſt all expound*, ſaith *Maldonat, with whom I cannot agree.* And againe, *The meaning of theſe words of Chriſt ſeemes not to bee that which all bring, whom I remember to haue read, except Hilary.* And yet againe, *The opinions of the Fathers touching this ſentence are diuerſe, but to ſpeake freely I reſt in none of them.* And, *All the Fathers almoſt ſo expound, but their interpretation ſeemeth not to me fit enough.* And laſtly, *Thus I expound it, and although I haue no Author for this expoſition, yet I approue it rather then that of Auguſtin and the reſt, albeit moſt probable becauſe it more croſſeth the meaning of the Caluiniſts.* Which laſt clauſe I would pray you well to conſider: for by it, not Conſent of Fathers, but croſſing of Caluiniſts is the rule of truth. O impudence! O perfidiouſneſſe! to boaſt and bragge ſo much of Fathers, and yet in truth to make ſo little reckoning of them. But to let you ſee how the world is cheated by theſe Impoſtors, heare a little further.

Antiq. Iud. l. 3. c. 4. De Decal. & de legg. ſpec.

Quæſt. 71. in Exod.

In Pſal. 31.

In Mat. 19. 11.

In Mat. 16. 18.

In Mat. 11. 11. & 13.

In Ioh. 6. 62.

If

If at any time, ſaith *Cardinall Cajetan*, *yee meet with a ſence agreeing with the text, although ſwarming from the ſtreame of the Doctors, let the Reader ſhew himſelfe an indifferent Cenſor, neither let any deteſt it for this cauſe, becauſe it diſagreeth from the ancient Doctors. For God hath not tyed the expoſition of the Scripture vnto the ſences of the ancient Doctors: otherwiſe all hope would bee taken from vs of expounding the Scripture.* This ſaying of *Cajetan* is I confeſſe reproued by ſome of your men: yet is hee defended by *Andradius*, who alſo ſaith, *We may forſake all the ſences of the Fathers, and bring a new vnlike vnto theirs*, and, *the Fathers ſpake not oracles when they expounded the Scripture.* *Maldonat* is very peremptory, *Whatſoeuer many ancient Fathers haue thought, whether it bee true Matrimony after a vow, the contrary is now true.* And *Duræus*, *The Fathers are not counted Fathers when they either write or teach of their owne, and what they haue not receiued from the Church.* And *Dominicus Bannes*, *The more part of Doctors if ſome few bee againſt them make no infallible argument in matters of Faith.* Dr *Marta* alſo, *The common opinion of Doctors is not to bee regarded, when another contrary opinion fauoureth the power of the keyes and the iuriſdiction of the Church.* Likewiſe *Bellarmine*, *The Fathers expound the Scriptures not as Iudges but as Doctors: now not to this but that authority is required.* And, *In expounding the Scripture the Catholike Church doth not alway and in all things follow the Fathers. The writings of the Fathers are no rules and haue no authority to bind vs.* Finally Tomtelroth *Cornelius Mus*, *To ſpeake freely I would yeeld more credence to one chiefe Biſhop in thoſe things which concerne the myſteries of Faith, then a thouſand Auguſtins, Hieromes, or Gregories.*

Proœm. in lib. Moyſis.

Defenſ. fid. Trid. l. 2.

Sum. q. 12. a. 4.

Con. Whitak. p. 140.

p. 1. pa. 73.

De iuriſd. p. 4.

De verb. Dei l. 3. c. 10.

De conc.

In Rom. 14.

Reinol. Conf. c. 2. d. 2.

ries. And thus as a right learned writer saith, you vse the Fathers as Marchants are wont to vse their counters. Sometime they stand with you for pence, sometime for pounds, as they bee next and readiest at hand to make vp your accounts. So that I cannot but maruell, how you dare to make that the ground of your Faith, which the learnedst of your side so ordinarily reiect as an vnsure foundation to build vpon.

Shall I tell you, *M. Bayly?* you haue been fouly gulled and beguiled by your new Masters. For notwithstanding all this faire pretence of Fathers: yet in the end, not Consent of Fathers, but the authority of the present Church must bee your surest anchorhold. So saith *Gregory de Valentia*, a man well seene in the Romish mysteries, *Neither the holy Scripture, nor yet tradition alone, if yee separate from it the present authority in the Church, is that infallible authority, and mistresse of Faith.* So *Bellarmine* also, *The firmity of all ancient Councels and Doctrines depends vpon the authority of the present Church.* And this reason they render, because without the authority of the present Church yee can neuer haue infallible certainty, either of Scripture, or Councels, or Traditions, which they bee, or what is the true meaning of them. So that now you must of force remoue your Faith from the ancient Fathers, and rest it vpon the present Church. But what? are you now more safe then you were before? Neuer a whit, vnlesse you may further bee resolued, what is the present Church. For it is taken three seuerall wayes by you: and is either the 1. Church essentiall consisting of all Catholicks whatsoeuer, or 2. Representatiue of Bishops in a Coūcell, or Virtuall the Pope who is head of the Church. Now which of these

Tom. in Thom. 3. d. 1. q. 1. p. 7. §. 3.

De Sacram. l. 2. c. 25.

Prier. in Luth. tom. 1. fund. 2. 3.

theſe three muſt you pitch vpon? The firſt. So ſay ſome. But the moſt part of this Church is the Vulgar who are not comprehenſiue of thoſe matters which are controuerted: neither is it poſſible for you to gather the voices of ſuch a diuided and diſperſed body. Others therefore direct you to the ſecond: But what? to a Councell with the Pope or without the Pope? For here is ſuch confuſion of tongues, and part taking of each ſide, that I feare you will hardly find any reſt for the ſole of your foote this way. Howbeit, if the moſt voices of the new cut now adayes may ſway it, not a Councell without the Pope, but the Pope, whether with a Councell or without it, it mattereth not much, muſt bee the iudge and ground of Faith. *In this queſtion*, ſaith *Gregory de Valentia*, *by the Church wee meant the Roman Biſhops: in whom reſides the full authority of the Church when hee pleaſes to determine matters of Faith, whether hee doe it with a Councell or without.* And *Greuſer*, *when wee affirme the Church to bee iudge of all controuerſies of Faith; by the Church wee vnderſtand the B. of Rome, who for the time being gouernes the ſhip of the militant Church.* And *Albertin*, *I ſay that beſides the firſt verity, there is an infallible rule, liuing and endued with reaſon, ſuch as is the Church: and this rule liuing and endued with reaſon is the chiefe B. of Rome.* So that, *the Popes determination is the truth*, ſaith *Suares*, *and were it contrary to the ſayings of all the Saints, yet were it to bee preferred afore them: nay if an Angell from Heauen were oppoſed againſt him, the Popes determination were to bee preferred.* By all which you ſee, that as you haue once already remoued your Faith from the ancient Fathers to your Mother the preſent Church: ſo muſt you bee faine now againe to re-

Tom. 3. P. 24.

Def. Bellarm. to. 1. p. 1450. b.

Tom. 1. diſ. 44. Sect. 1.

moue it from your mother the preſent Church, vnto your holy Father the preſent Pope. But beſides that it is altogether vnprobable that the Spirit of Truth ſhould bee chained vnto the chaire of thoſe men, who many of them haue beene monſters rather then men, and not only Heretiks, but very Atheiſts and Infidels: I would willingly learne why the Pope is ſo ſeldome in the humour to decide controuerſies. Why haue wee not from him an exact Commentary on the Bible that wee need no longer ſtand in doubt of the meaning thereof? And why doth hee not ſtint the deadly ſo-hood that now is on foot betweene the *Ieſuites* and *Dominicans*? But ſuppoſe hee bee both able and ready to reſolue: what? muſt I trauell from *England* ſo farre as *Rome* for reſolution? and when I am arriued before him, hath hee clouen tongues ſitting vpon him to ſpeake vnto mee in the language I vnderſtand? Or if I vnderſtand him, how am I aſſured that ſpeaking to mee hee intendeth to teach the whole Church? for otherwiſe hee may erre, as *Bellarmine* ſhewes *Innocent* the eighth did, permitting the *Norwegians* to celebrate the ſacrifice of the Maſſe without wine. Shall I tell you a myſtery? Whatſoeuer your Prieſts and Ieſuits prate either of Fathers, or Church, or Pope, yet to an ordinary man who cannot of himſelfe be reſolued by them, the authority of his Dioceſan is ſufficient, yea and hee merits by beliefing it although what hee teach bee falſe. This perhaps may ſeeme ſtrange to you, yet thus ſaith *Gabriel Biel*, *If a ſimple and vnlearned man heare his Prelate preach any thing contrary to the Faith, thinking that what his Prelate hath ſo preached is beleeued by the Church, ſuch a one not only not ſinneth, but by beleeuing that which is falſe meriteth.* And *Tolet*, *Againe if*

De Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 14.

In 3. d. 25. q. vn. art. 1.

Inſtr. Sacer. l. 4. c. 3.

a

a Country-man beliue his Bishop propounding some hereticall Doctrine about the Articles, he meriteth by beliuing although it be an error: because hee is bound to beliue vntill it manifestly appeare that it is against the Church. O immortall God, if this bee true, how easy a thing is it for a Papist to bee saued? Onely beliue what your Prelate or Curate telleth you, and you shall not need to trouble your selfe further: for whether it be true or false, sound doctrine or heresy, you are out of danger, nay it is meritorious to beliue it. Alas, alas that poore simple people should bee so miserably cheated and seduced. God I hope will ere long open their eyes to see these impostures, and by the light of his word guide their feet in a surer way. In the meane season giue me leaue to summe vp all what I haue hitherto sayd, and thereupon to inferre the Conclusion first intended. Seeing therefore, as wee haue now fully demonstrated, the Fathers were but men as wee are, neither hauing the Promise, nor assuming vnto themselues the Priuiledge of Infallibility aboue vs: seeing secondly, many Counterfaits are set forth vnder the names of the Fathers, which the best of your side cannot so readily discerne, and which they ordinarily alledge in euery controuersie betwixt vs for authenticall Fathers: seeing thirdly, the writings of the Fathers are pitifully corrupted and adulterated by Hereticks and others, and that sundry wayes, by Addition, Substraction, Alteration, Misquotation, and False translation: seeing fourthly, the sayings of the Fathers are so ambiguous and obscure, that not onely we and you one against another, but your owne side also among themselues are distracted and diuided touching the sence and meaning of them: seeing fiftly, the more part of the

1.
2.
3.
4
5.

Fathers sometime consent in errour, yea and such errors as the present Church of Rome condemneth with *Anathema*: seeing sixtly, the most learned of your side make no scruple to reiect the Fathers whensoeuer they consent against them, and warrant their so doing with diuerse reasons: seeing lastly, they make not Consent of Fathers, but the authority of the present Church, that is to say, the Pope for the time being, to bee the onely Infallible iudge of Controuersies: seeing I say all these things are vndoubtedly so, I will not bee afraid to conclude, that the pretended Consent of Fathers is too weake and deceitfull a ground for a man with security to build his Faith vpon.

6

7

8

For whereas you say that beleeuing as the Fathers did, if they bee saued (as doubtlesse they are) you cannot miscary: take heed lest this proue but a broken reed, and deceiue you in the end. For first, if for the reasons aboue set down, you cannot be infallibly certaine which are the true Fathers, and what is their right meaning: how can you bee infallibly certaine that you beleeue as they did? Againe, doe you thinke it safe to hold all their errors also? and because they are not condemned for them, that you shall escape condemnation in like manner beleeuing them? Heare then what *Vincentius Lirinensis* saith, *O wonderfull change of things*, saith hee! *the Authors of the same opinion are iudged Catholicks, and the followers Heretiks: the Masters are absolued, and the Schollers condemned: the Writers of the books shall bee the Sonnes of the Kingdome, and Hell shall keep those that maintaine them. For who doubts but blessed Cyprian the light of Bishops and holy Martyrs, together with the rest of his Collegues shall raigne for euer with Christ? Contrarily*

Cont. Hær. c. 10.

rily who is ſo impious as to deny, that the Donatiſts and the reſt of that peſtilent crew, who vnder the authority of that Councell preſume to rebaptize, ſhall burne for euermore with the Diuell? Thus hee: whereby you ſee how dangerous it is to beleeue euen as the beſt haue done before vs, vnleſſe wee haue better warrant then ſo for our doing. Laſtly, ſuppoſe the Fathers conſenting erred not, yet are you neuer the ſafer. For the ſtrength of Faith exceeds not the ſtrength of the teſtimony, nor the ſtrength of the teſtimony the Veracity of the Witneſſe. Now the Veracity of the Fathers is but the Veracity of men, and the Veracity of men is imperfect and inconſtant, euer leauing roome for that word of truth *All men are lyers*. Whence it followeth that your Faith being grounded only on the Veracity of men, is no better then an *Acquiſite and Humane Faith*. Whereby though you beliue all that the Fathers did, yet not beliuing as they did, they may bee ſaued and you periſh. For they building vpon diuine teſtimony beliued with a Diuine Faith, and therefore ſauing: but you relying on humane authority beliue onely with an Acquiſite and Humane Faith which ſaueth not, no not although the things you beliue thereby are true. For an Acquiſite Faith the diuels themſelues may haue and yet are damned.

Wherefore it being as you ſee ſo dangerous and vnſafe to truſt in man, and as the Prophet ſpeaketh, to make fleſh your arme: let mee entreat you euen in the bowels of Ieſus Chriſt, to take vnto you Chriſtian ſeuerity, and with all ſpeed to returne your Faith backe againe vpon the rocke, from which ſo raſhly and vnaduiſedly you remoued it. Remember I beſeech you how S. *Auguſtin*,

in

in a controuerſy betwixt him and *Hierome* touching S. *Peters* diſſimulation, hauing eleuated the authority of foure of thoſe ſeuen Fathers which were vrged againſt him, and not being able to oppoſe three to the other three remaining, quitteth himſelfe thus, *When* ſaith he, *I ſeeke a third, that I alſo may oppoſe three to three, verily I ſuppoſe I might eaſily find him, if I had read much: howbeit to mee the Apoſtle Paul ſhall bee inſteed of all, yea and aboue them all. To him I flie, to him I appeale, of him I aske and demand, &c.* In like manner doe you alſo, and in Gods name let your finall appeale bee made vnto the holy Scriptures, as vnto the ſupreme iudge in all queſtions of Faith. For as *Cyril* B. of *Ieruſalem*, ſaith, *The ſecurity of our Faith ariſeth from the demonſtration of the holy Scripture: and the reſolution of thoſe things we ſeeke for, muſt bee taken out of the diuine inſpired Scripture*, ſaith *Conſtantin* in his oration to the Biſhops of the *Nicen Councell*. And reaſon; for the Scriptures *are the rule of Faith*, as *Tertullian* and *Auguſtin* ſay. *A ſtraight and inflexible rule*, as *Gregory Nyſſen* ſaith. *A moſt exquiſite rule and exact ſquare and ballance to trie all things by*, ſaith *Chryſoſtome*. In regard whereof ſaith Saint *Auguſtin*, *If a matter bee grounded on the euident authority of holy Scripture, ſuch (I ſay) as the Church calleth Canonicall, it is without all doubt to bee beleiued: but as touching other witneſſes and teſtimonies, vpon whoſe credit a thing is vrged vpon vs to bee beleiued, thou mayeſt lawfully either credit or not credit them, as thou perceiueſt them to deſerue or not to deſerue credit.* And *Optatus* B. of *Mileuis*, *you affirme, wee deny: betweene your yea and our nay, the ſoules of the people wauer and ſtagger. Let no man beleiue either you or vs: Wee are all contentious men. Wee*

Epiſt. 19.

Catech. 4.
Theod. l. 1. c. 7.

Con. Herm. De bon. vid. c. 1.
Orat. de ijs q. adeunt. Hieroſol.
Hom. 13. in 2. Cor.
Epiſt. 112. ad Paulin.

Con. Parmen. l. 5.

must

muſt ſeeke out iudges. If Chriſtians, both ſides cannot yeeld them, and part taking would hinder truth. Wee muſt ſeeke for a iudge without. If a Pagan, hee knowes not the myſteries of Chriſtianity: if a Iew, hee is an enemie to Chriſtian Baptiſme. Therefore vpon earth no iudgment touching this matter can bee found. Wee muſt ſeeke a iudge from heauen. But why knocke wee at heauen ſeeing here in the Goſpell wee haue his will and teſtament. With theſe Fathers your owne men accord. *The holy doctrine,* ſaith *Thomas* of *Aquin, vſeth ſuch authorities* (of profane writers) *as forraine and probable arguments: but the authorities of Canonicall Scripture it vſeth arguing properly and neceſſarily, and the authorities of the Doctors of the Church, as diſputing indeed properly, yet onely probably. For our Faith relyeth on that reuelation which was made to the Apoſtles and Prophets who wrote the Canonicall books: but not on reuelation made to other Doctors, if any ſuch haue beene.* And *Bellarmin, The ſacred Scripture is the rule of Faith moſt ſafe and certaine: and God hath taught vs by corporall letters which wee may ſee and read what he would haue vs beleiue concerning him.* And *Stapleton, The diuine Scriptures alone yeeld infallible teſtimony and ſuch as is meerely diuine.* And *Perſius* alſo, *The authority of no Saint is of infallible truth: for S. Auguſtin giues that honour onely to the ſacred Scripture.* But why vouch I human authority hauing diuine? God himſelfe by the Prophet ſummons vs *vnto the law* and *to the teſtimony*, affirming that if any ſpeake not *according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them.* Our Sauiour Chriſt commandeth *to ſearch the Scriptures* as which teſtify of him, and wherein *eternall life is to bee had. Abraham* referred the rich gluttons brethren to *Moſes*

Sum. p. 1. q. 1. a. 8. ad. 2.

De verb. Dei. l. 1. c. 2.

Del. con. Whit. l. 2. De rat. Con. l. 2. c. 19.

Eſa. 8. 20.

Ioh. 5. 39.

Luc. 16. 31.

Moſes and the Prophets aſſuring himſelfe that if they refuſed to heare them, neither would they be perſwaded though one roſe from the dead. The holy Apoſtle Paul chargeth *vs not to preſume aboue that which is written:* in as much as the *Scriptures are able to make vs wiſe vnto ſalvation through the Faith that is in Chriſt Ieſus, and are profitable for doctrine, for reproofe, for correction, for inſtruction in righteouſneſſe, that the man of God may bee perfect, throughly furniſhed vnto all good works.* To what end did Saint *Luke* write his Goſpell? was it not that we *might know the certainty of thoſe things wherein wee are inſtructed.* This ſaith Saint *Paul*, *is a very ſafe courſe.* And hence was it that the *Bereans* ſearched the Scripture ſo carefully, that they might bee fully aſſured of thoſe things which were taught thē. *We haue a more ſure word of Prophecy*, ſaith Saint *Peter*, *whereunto yee doe well that yee take heed as vnto a light that ſhineth in a darke place, vntill the day dawne, and the day-ſtarre ariſe in your hearts.* But S. *Paul* is yet more peremptory, *Though we*, ſaith hee, *or an Angell from heauen preach any other Goſpell vnto you then that which wee haue preached vnto you, let him bee accurſed. What is it*, ſaith *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, *that hee ſaith, though wee? Why not rather, though I? His meaning is, though Peter, though Andrew, though Iohn, yea though the whole Colledge of Apoſtles preach vnto you otherwiſe then wee haue preached, let him bee anathema.* A fearefull ſtraine, for the maintenance of the firſt Faith neither to ſpare himſelfe, nor his fellow Apoſtles. It is but a little. *Although*, ſaith hee, *an Angell from heauen preach otherwiſe then wee haue preached vnto you, let him bee Anathema.* It ſufficed not for the preſeruation of the Faith once deliuered to mention the nature of humane

1. Cor. 4. 6.

2. Tim. 3. 15. 16. 17.

Luc. 1. 3. 4.

Phil. 3. 1.

Act. 17. 11.

2. Pet. 1. 19.

Gal. 1. 8.

Contra Hær. c. 12.

conditi-

condition, vnleſſe he comprehended Angelicall excellency alſo. *Though*, ſaith hee *wee or an Angell from heauen.* Thus you ſee that the Faith which was firſt deliuered, & is now contained in the Scripture, is the ſoueraigne rule and iudge of all the doctrines both of men and Angels. For whatſoeuer the Apoſtles preached, the ſame is written, as *Irenæus* teſtifieth. Whereupon Saint *Auguſtin*, *As touching Chriſt, or his Church, or any other thing pertaining to our Faith or life, I will not ſay, if wee, who are no way to bee compared with him that ſaid, Though wee, but as it is added, if an Angell from heauen preach vnto you otherWiſe then what yee haue receiued in the Legall and Euangelicall Scriptures, let him be accurſed.* Lib. 3. c. 2. Cont. Petil. l. 3. c. 6.

Happily you will ſay, the Scripture is indeed the rule of Faith, and the law of the Church, but not the Iudge; or if Iudge, yet but a mute and dumbe Iudge: and if there bee not ſome externall, viſible, audible, infallible, vnerring Iudge to interpret Scriptures, and to ſtint all controuerſies, there will neuer bee an end of quarels, neither will there euer bee peace and vnity in the Church. Indeed, the name of vnity and peace is a goodly thing, and a finall end of all controuerſies, might it bee had, were much to bee wiſhed for. But I feare the Church will not bee ſo happy, ſo long as it dwelleth in tabernacles, and is militant here on earth. Otherwiſe the holy Apoſtle would neuer haue written thus to the Corinthians, *I heare that there bee diuiſions among you, and I partly believe it: For there muſt bee alſo hereſies among you, that they which are approued may be made manifeſt among you.* And the generall experience of former ages confirmeth the ſame, wherein God continually hath exercized his Church, either with the fire of perſecutions, 1. Cor. 11. 18. 19.

that it might appeare who they are that loue him more then the preſent world: or with the tempeſts of contra-
2. ry doctrines, that it might bee knowne who are chaffe, and who wheat, who ſound in the Faith, and who not. Beſides this, mee thinks the facilneſſe and eaſineſſe of the way which your new Maſters prefcribe vnto you, ſhould make you much to ſuſpect the goodneſſe of it.
Pſal. 1. 2. & 119. For whereas it is the good pleaſure of God that all men ſhould carefully & diligently ſtudie the holy Scriptures, & reading them, and meditating in them night and day, to the end they may grow rich in all knowledge and vnderſtanding: you by your rule may ſpare all this paines, and though you ſit ſtill, take your eaſe, and fold your hands, yet if you believe whatſoeuer your exter-nall human iudge ſhall dictate vnto you, you are ſafe and cannot miſcarry. Now among ſimple and vnlettered Papiſts who is this Iudge, but ſome Prieſt or Ieſuite: for other Iudge I am ſure they meet with none. A plauſible courſe I confeſſe to many, ſpecially thoſe that are idle and loth to take paines, or weake and dare not truſt their owne iudgement, or ſuperſtitious and thinke they merit much by their blind obedience vnto their teach-ers. But how plauſible ſoeuer it may ſeeme to fleſh and blood, ſure I am it is too broad to bee the narrow way that leadeth vnto life: and the Kingdome of Heauen will neuer be attained, vnleſſe it ſuffer more violence then ſo.
I adde further, it is too preſumptuous to tie Diuine Pro-uidence vnto humane policy, and for man firſt to deuiſe what in his wiſdome ſeemeth fitteſt, and then to reſolue that therefore God hath ordered it ſo. Yet this is the courſe your ſide ordinarily holdeth: you loue rather to giue lawes vnto God, then to take lawes from him, and

in

in this particular, to preſcribe what meanes God ſhould appoint to ſettle vs in the knowledge of his truth, rather then to vſe the meanes which hee himſelfe hath to that end appointed. If you thinke this too hard a cenſure, bo it knowne vnto you that *Bellarmine* the Prince of Ieſuits reaſoneth ſo. *God*, ſaith hee, *who was not ignorant that many difficulties concerning the Faith would riſe vp in the Church: hee ought therefore to prouide ſome Iudge for the Church.* What Iudge? Such a one doubtleſſe as by his ſole authority and ſentence muſt bee able to reſolue all difficulties. Which for as much as neither Scripture, nor any ſecular Prince can doe: therefore it muſt needs bee the Prince of Eccleſiaſticall, that is, the Pope. See I beſeech you how peruerſly and prepoſterouſly they deale with you: firſt they take vpon them to direct God what he ſhould doe, or elſe forſooth he ſhall not be prouident and diſcreet enough, and then thruſt their owne fancy vpon you as a point of Faith, that God hath done it. De verb. Dei. l. 3. c. 9.

But to anſwer this yet a little more fully, I affirme three things. Firſt, that holy Scripture knowes not, ſecondly, that the ancient Fathers acknowledge not, thirdly, that as long as wee haue the Scripture there needs not any ſuch ſtanding humane Iudge in the Church, as you dreame of. As touching the firſt, if you know any paſſage of Scripture wherein God hath authorized ſuch a Iudge as you dreame of, I require you to ſhew it, for my part I know none. Expreſſe Scripture I am ſure you cannot ſhew: deductions and conſequences by your owne rule I haue no reaſon to admit. For example, if for proofe hereof you vrge that of our Sauiour to S. *Peter, I haue prayed for thee that thy Faith faile not*: I would Luc. 22. 32.

demand who ſhall bee iudge of the meaning of theſe words? for I heare that Chriſt hath prayed for Saint *Peter*, but I heare not that hee hath prayed for the Pope, that his Faith fayle not: and I know Saint *Peter* was firme and conſtant in the faith vnto his liues end, but it ſeemes by Eccleſiaſticall Hyſtory that ſundry Popes haue made ſhipwracke of the Faith, and become Hereticks. If there be no Iudge to determine this doubt, why doe you thruſt ſuch a Iudge vpon vs? If there bee, who is hee? you will ſay, the Pope. Then thus you reaſon, Chriſt prayed for S. *Peter* that his *Faith might not faile*, by S. *Peter* the Pope alſo is vnderſtood, and this appeares becauſe the Pope ſaith ſo: therefore neither can the Popes Faith faile and conſequently he is the ordinary infallible Iudge of the Church More briefly thus, the Pope is that Iudge, becauſe the Pope will haue it ſo. Nominate what other Iudge ſoeuer you liſt, and what other Text beſides you pleaſe, and the argument is ſtill the ſame, too weake to perſuade what you intend, vnleſſe by ſome new priuiledge out of any premiſſes you may conclude what you will. In a word, ſearch the Scriptures throughout, and you ſhall finde the Miniſtery and ſeruice of men eſtabliſhed to bring vs to the Faith: but an infallible humane magiſtery and Lordſhip to command Faith, it knowes none. That prerogatiue Royall it referues onely vnto Chriſt himſelfe.

Neither doe the ancient Fathers acknowledge any ſuch Iudge, which is the ſecond point. If they doe, point I pray to the place, for hitherto it hath beene vnknowne. Many and ſharp bickerings had thoſe ancients with diuers and ſundry Heretiks, as *Arius*, *Macedonius*, *Eutyches*, *Neſtorius*, and the like: yet neuer did they either

either obiect vnto them that they wanted an infallible Iudge, as you doe vnto vs, or conuent them before the tribunall of such a Iudge, which doubtlesse had beene a readier way then disputation to stop their mouths, had there been such a soueraigne Officer in the Church. Sundry and manifold are the writings of the ancient Fathers touching the Christian Faith, of which some also were purposely written to instruct vs in all the doctrines of our religion: and is it not strange that such men, in such books, remembring carefully all other points, should forget so maine and principall a point as this is? Nay more then this, *Tertullian* long agoe wrote a booke of Prescriptions or Fore-pleadings against Hereticks: Saint *Augustin* also wrote foure books of Christian Doctrine, wherein his direct intent is to prescribe rules how to vnderstand and interpret Scripture: And *Vincentius Lirinensis* also hath written a short Commonitory for the Antiquity and Verity of the Catholike Faith against the profane nouelties of all Heresies. If these Fathers had acknowledged this your imaginary Iudge, how commeth it to passe that they no where mention him in these books? For certainly here was the proper place, and they could not without extreame supinity and negligence omit him, had they knowne such a one: such a one I say, as vpon whom the security of Faith, and vnity of the Church dependeth. But this deep silence of theirs, and that in so due a place, and of matter so important, euidently argues that they neuer were acquainted therewith, and that it is but an Idole of these latter times.

Now if neither Scripture nor Fathers know such a Iudge, I hope I may bee bold to inferre that the Church needs

needs him not, which is the third point. For I trow this is both a ſafer and ſounder kind of reaſoning then that of yours, *Such a Iudge wee conceiue to bee neceſſary, Therefore ſuch a one hath God ordained.* But to cleere this point alſo, I affirme that the Scriptures by themſelues, through Gods bleſſing vpon our endeauour, is a ſufficient outward meanes to bring vs to ſaluation: and therefore there is no neceſſity of your externall Iudge. The Conſequence is plaine and euident: the Antecedent thus I proue, becauſe all whatſoeuer is neceſſary to ſaluation is ſo cleerely and manifeſtly deliuered in them, euen to the capacity of vulgar and ordinary men, that if they will either read or heare it read vnto them, they cannot but know and vnderſtand it. This I could eaſily ſhew in euery particular and fundamentall point, but that I ſhould hold you too long. Only if it bee not ſo, tell me, why doth the Holy Ghoſt ſay, that *they giue wiſedome to the ſimple, and light to the eyes? that they are a lanterne to our feete and a light vnto our paths? that the entrance into them ſheweth light, and giueth vnderſtanding to the ſimple?* And why doth the holy Apoſtle S. *Peter* tearme them *a light ſhining in a darke place?* Neither is it to bee neglected, that all this is meant of the Scripturs of the old Teſtament: which if they bee ſo lightſome, how bright and cleere are they of the new? *Theſe things are written,* ſaith *Saint Iohn, to the end yee might beleeue that Ieſus is the Chriſt the Sonne of God, and that beleeuing yee might haue life through his Name.* And *Saint Paul, The things that are written, are written for our inſtruction.* Now if the Scriptures in things neceſſary be ſo obſcure and hard to vnderſtand, either it is becauſe the Holy Ghoſt could not write more plainely, or becauſe he would not. That

Pſ. 19. 8. 9. Pſ. 119. 105. 130.

2. Pet. 1. 19.

Ioh. 20. 31.

Rom. 15. 4.

hee

hee could not, no man will ſay: that hee would not, croſſeth the end of his writing, which was, as is aboue ſaid, to inſtruct in the Faith, and to bring vs vnto life. But that God by writing obſcurely, and yet commanding vs to ſearch, ſhould either intend to mocke vs, or faile of his owne end, cannot bee imagined without notable impiety. Heare what the Fathers ſay. *Iuſtin Martyr, Harken to the things which I ſhall report from the holy Scriptures, which Scriptures need not to bee expounded, but onely heard.* Dial. cum. Tryph. *Clemens of Alexandria, Heare yee that are farre off, heare yee that are nigh: the Word is hidden from none, it is a common light, it ſhineth vnto all men, there is no Cimmerian darkeneſſe in it, let vs haſten to ſaluation, to regeneration.* Exhort. ad. Ethnic. *Chryſoſtome, All things neceſſary are cleere and plaine in the Scriptures, ſo that were it not through our owne negligence wee ſhould not need Homilies and Sermons.* In. 2. Theſſ. hom. 3. *Auguſtin, In thoſe things which are plainely ſet downe in the Scripture, are found all thoſe things which containe Faith and Manners of life, to wit, Hope and Charity.* Doct. Chriſt. l. 2. c. 9. And *Bernard, The wayes of the Lord are ſtraight, faire, full, and plaine wayes. Straight without error, becauſe they lead vnto life: faire without filth becauſe they teach cleanneſſe: full for multitude, becauſe all the world is within Chriſts net: plaine without difficulty, becauſe they yeeld ſweetneſſe.* Ser. in illud. Sap. Iuſtum deduxit. Hereunto your owne men agree. *Sixtus Senenſis* diuideth the Scripture into two parts, granting that the one is cleere and euident, containing the *firſt and higheſt principles of things that are to be beleeued, and the chiefe precepts of good life, and examples eaſy to bee knowne, ſuch as are ſome morall ſentences, and certaine holy Hiſtories, profitable for the ordering of manners.* Biblioth. l. 6. ann. 152. And *Gregory of Valentia, Such verities concerning* Anal. Fid. p. 100.

our Faith as are abſolutely and neceſſarily to bee knowne and belieued of all men, are in a manner plainely taught in the Scriptures themſelues. Thus all things neceſſary to ſaluation are ſo plainely ſet downe in Scripture, that at leaſt wiſe for the determination of them your externall Humane Iudge needeth not.

Yea but neither are all ſatisfied with theſe plaine places, neither are all places of Scripture plaine. True. Yet haue you no reaſon to doubt of that which is plaine, becauſe ſome through frowardneſſe will not vnderſtand: no more then you haue of the ſnow whether it be white, becauſe *Anaxagoras* thought that it was blacke. If nothing can be certaine but that which is vnqueſtioned, we muſt all turne Scepticks, and neuer beleeue any thing. For as in Philoſophy, ſo in Diuinity, there is nothing almoſt ſo abſurd, but one or other hath held: and what diſpute there is euen about this Iudge of yours, and the laſt reſolution of Faith, you cannot bee ignorant. As for thoſe darker places, if you vnderſtand them not, yet aſſenting vnto the plainer you are without danger, ſeeing in thoſe plainer, as wee haue ſhewed, all things neceſſary are comprehended. Neither is their darkeneſſe ſo great, but that without your torch-bearer they may bee enlightned. For as *Hierome* ſaith, *It is the order of the Scripture after hard things to ſet downe things that are plaine, and what is firſt ſpoken in Parables, afterward to deliuer in cleere tearmes.* And *Auguſtin, There is nothing almoſt among thoſe obſcurities, but in other places one may find it moſt plainely deliuered.* And *Chryſoſtome, The Scripture euery where when it ſpeaketh any thing obſcurely, interpreteth it ſelfe againe in another place.* So the reſt. And hence they gather, that Scripture is to bee interpreted

In Eſa. 19.

Doct. Chriſt. l. 2, c. 6.

In. 2. Cor. hom. 9.

terpreted by Scripture, and the doubtfull places by thoſe that are more certaine, as appeareth in their writings: but ſpecially by Saint *Auguſtin* in his books of Chriſtian Doctrine, purpoſely by him written to demonſtrate as much. According to this precept was their continuall practice, and what interpretation they found agreeing with plaine Scripture and the particular circumſtances of the text, that they admitted as true: but what they iudged to ſwarue from it, that they reiected as contrary to the *Analogie of Faith*, and the Principles of our Religion. Which courſe if wee alſo take (and this courſe wee ought to take, vnleſſe wee thinke that God is not the beſt interpreter of his owne words) we cannot, at leaſtwiſe dangerouſly erre in our interpretations: and we may boldly refuſe thoſe as falſe which we find contrary vnto this *Analogie of Faith*. For example, Theſe words of Chriſt, *This is my Body*, wee vnderſtand thus, *This Bread is Sacramentally my Body*: you thus, *This Bread is turned or tranſubſtantiated into my Body*. The queſtion now is, whether is the truer interpretation yours or ours. Let vs trie it by this rule. Your owne *Scotus* and *Cameracenſis* thinke *that opinion which holdeth the ſubſtance of bread and wine to remaine, to bee the more probable and reaſonable opinion, yea and in all appearance more agreeable with the words of inſtitution.* In regard whereof ſaith *Bellarmine, It may iuſtly be doubted whether the text bee cleere enough to inforce it (tranſubſtantiation) ſeeing moſt learned and witty men, ſuch as Scotus was, haue thought the contrary.* So that in theſe mens iudgement the likelyhood is on our ſide, and you haue great reaſon to doubt of your expoſition. Beſides this, the Analogy of Faith teacheth vs, that Chriſts Bo-

4 d. l. 11. q. 3. lit. F. Quæſt. in. 4. q. 6. a. 2. Lit. F.

De Euchar. l. 3. c. 23.

dy is a true Body like vnto ours: but that Body which you fancy to be in the Euchariſt is not like vnto our bodies. For in this Body there is no diſtance of one part from another, as of eye from eye, and head from feet, neither hath it any dimenſiue quantity, and is all both in Heauen and here on earth in the Sacrament at once, yet not in the middle region betweene, nor ſeparated from himſelfe: but nothing of this can bee affirmed of our bodies, or of any other organicall body. And if you ſay that you conceiue of Chriſts Body in the Sacrament as of a glorified Body, the plaine Scripture is againſt you, that when Chriſt ſpake theſe words, *This is my Body*, his Body was yet vncrucified and vnglorified. Your expoſition therefore croſſing the *Analogy* cannot poſſibly bee good. As for ours thus we ſhew it. The text plainely ſaith, that our bleſſed Sauiour in his laſt ſupper tooke Bread, bleſſed it, brake it, and gaue it vnto his diſciples ſaying, *This is my Body*. What? This bread. But this Propoſition, *This Bread is my Body*, literally and properly is not true: therefore is it figuratiuely to be vnderſtood. How ſo? Thus. I looke into plaine Scripture, and there I find that as the Euangeliſts call it Bread before Conſecration, ſo Saint *Paul* cals it Bread after Conſecration. *As often*, ſaith he, *as yee ſhall eat this Bread.* and, *Whoſoeuer ſhall eat this Bread vnworthily*, and, *Let a man examine himſelfe, and ſo eat of this Bread.* Whence I conclude that the Bread is not changed, but remaineth ſtill Bread. Then I conſider further that our Sauiour now inſtitutes a Sacrament, and that in Sacramentall actions Sacramentall phraſes are vſuall, and the outward ſigne is called by the name of the thing ſignified: as in the old Teſtament, Circumciſion is called the Couenant, and

1. Cor. 11. 26.
Ib. v. 27.
Ib. v. 28.
Gen. 7. 10.

the

the Lambe the Paſſeouer, and in the new, the Cup is called the new Teſtament or couenant. Whereupon I inferre, there being no reaſon to the contrary, that theſe words in like manner are to bee interpreted, *This is my Body*, that is, *This Bread is Sacramentally my Body*, or *the Sacramentall ſigne of my Body*. And thus you ſee by clearing this one paſſage, how other darker places alſo may receiue light from thoſe that are plainer. You will ſay, this is to build vpon Conſequences, wherein it is poſſible to bee deceiued. Whereunto I anſwer three things, firſt, that whatſoeuer may bee deduced out of the Word of God by euident Conſequence is certaine, euen by the certainty of Faith; and this your owne greateſt clarks doe grant. Secondly, to baniſh Conſequences from Diuinity, is to baniſh the vſe of right reaſon and diſcourſe alſo: and that religion muſt needs bee driuen to narrow ſhifts, which cannot ſubſiſt vnleſſe men turne fooles or beaſts. Thirdly, the neceſſity of a Conſequence doth not any way depend vpon the perſon of him that inferreth it, but onely vpon the mutuall relation and ſtrait coniunction betweene the premiſſes and it: ſo that by him who deſires to bee ſatisfied in the truth, not the perſon of him that deduceth it, but the Conſequence it ſelfe is to bee looked too, whether it bee rightly deduced or no. But who ſhall iudge that will you ſay? Indeed if you ſtand reſolued vtterly to renounce all the helps and directions both of reaſon and art, nor will yeeld to any Conſequence of Scripture how cleere and euident ſoeuer, but will only rely on the mouth and ſentence of your humane externall Iudge: I confeſſe I am at *Dulkarnon* (to vſe *Chaucers* phraſe) and you are paſt my skill infallibly to perſwade you. But if, as wee haue

Ex. 12. 11. Luc. 22. 20.

1

2

3

Bell. de Iuſt. l. 3. c. 8.

4

ſhewed, nor Scripture nor Fathers acknowledge ſuch a
"Iudge, if all whatſoeuer is neceſſary to ſaluation bee ſo
"plainely laid downe in Scripture as a man of meane ca-
"pacity may vnderſtand it, if what is more obſcurely de-
"liuered in one place is more plainely expreſſed in ano-
"ther, if God haue appointed that out of the plainer pla-
"ces wee ſhould with ſtudy and induſtrie picke the mea-
"ning of thoſe that are harder, if hee haue promiſed that
"thoſe that aske ſhall haue, thoſe that ſeeke ſhall find, and
"to thoſe that knocke it ſhall bee opened, if finally though
"wee miſſe the true meaning of thoſe harder places, yet
"firmely adhering vnto the plainer, wee are ſafe and out
"of danger: then certainely the readieſt and ſureſt way to
"to interpret Scripture is by Scripture, and there is no o-
"ther way to determine controuerſies and to ſatisfy the
"conſcience but onely this. If any notwithſtanding this
1. Cor. 11. liſt ſtill to bee contentious, *Wee*, ſaith S. *Paul haue no ſuch cuſtome, nor the Churches of God.* The rule it ſelfe is infallible and al-ſufficient: if wee either through ignorance cannot, or through negligence doe not vſe it as we ought, the fault is not in God, but in our ſelues, neither doth hee faile in his prouidence, but wee in our dutie. Performe wee our duty obediently, and hee will performe his promiſe faithfully. In neceſſaries hee will neuer faile: if in other things all be not of one mind, yet let vs ſtill proceed by the ſame rule, and inſtruct one another in the ſpirit of meekneſſe, and God will reueale that alſo in due time.

And now, *M. Bayly*, you haue what I intended for the preſent: it remaines that you peruſe it attentiuely. The ſumme is. The Fathers may be Miniſters by whom you beliеue, but their Conſent is no ground of Faith. Your

externall

externall humane Iudge is but a Chimera of mans braine, and not an Officer of Gods making. The onely all-sufficient infallible outward rule of Faith is Scripture in the plainer places, which places also must interpret the difficulter. Besides this albeit there may be a iurisdiction in the Church to order and controll the outer man: yet to satisfy the Conscience and inner man there is no authority but this. Which things being so, let me entreat you, and that in the bowels of Iesus Christ, to remember from whence you are fallen and to cast about yet againe, and by this rule to examine your new Faith. It is not necessary for a man to be an *Euclid* or some cunning *Mathematician* to trie by a straight rule whether a line be straight or no. But you are a Scholler and a Minister, and should bee able skilfully to apply the rule your selfe. To trust anothers application of it for you, and that in the point of saluation, is not Christian modestie, but meere childishnesse, and fooliſh credulity. Remember what *Lactantius* saith, *It behoueth a man, specially in that thing wherein the state of our life consisteth, to trust himselfe, and to rely vpon his own iudgement and vnderstanding for finding out & examining the truth, rather then beleiuing anothers errors to be deceiued, as if himselfe were void of reason. God hath giuen to all men some portion of wisedome, whereby they may both find out what they haue not heard, and examine what they haue heard.* This gift of God, this Wisdome I meane, and illumination of Gods Spirit, vse I beseech you to the glory of the donour, and the building of your selfe vp in your most holy Faith. This you shall doe, if shaking off this blind beliefe of the dictates and decrees of men, you simply and absolutely yeeld all credence to God alone & his word,

Div. Instit. l. 2. c. 8.

and.

and to men no otherwise then vnder God, and for God. For as the same *Lactantius* saith, with whose words I conclude, *Wisdome and Religion are so neerely ioyned together, that they may not bee seuered one from the other: in so much as neither any religion is to bee embraced without wisdome, nor any wisdome to be approued without religion.* The Lord giue you a cleane heart, and renew within you a right Spirit: so prayeth for you from the bottome of his heart,

Ib. l. 4. c. 4. & 1. c. 1.

Your vnfained friend and louing brother
IOHN DOWNE.

OF

OF SITTING AND KNEELING AT THE COMMVNION.

VNTO the ſchedule you ſent mee, contayning your beſt reaſons for Sitting againſt Kneeling, I here returne you this ſhort anſwer. Your end doubtleſſe was by ſtrength of argument to withdraw mee from conformity in Kneeling: my intent is, by diſcouering the weakneſſe of your arguments, to worke you from ſingularity in Sitting. The iſſue I leaue vnto God: yet I truſt that as my perſuaſion and example this laſt Eaſter, as you know, reduced diuers, ſo my Reply through the bleſſing of God may alſo reclaime

claime you. God grant that being brethren, and children of one common mother: wee may with one accord obſerue her orders, and honor her authority.

Your writing firſt maintaines ſitting, then oppoſes kneeling. Of ſitting you affirme thus, *Wee ought to ſit at the receiuing of the Elements of the Lords Supper.* In which Propoſition I doubt of one tearme, and ſuſpect another. The tearme I doubt of is this, *Wee ought to ſit*, namely what you meane thereby. For if either the nature of the Phraſe, or the Concluſion of your third Syllogiſme may determine it, then is it equiualent vnto this, *We muſt ſit*, & imports a neceſſity of ſitting, or that ſitting is the only lawful geſture. But if we iudge thereof by the probable intention of the two firſt Syllogiſmes, then the meaning thereof ſeemes to bee no more then this, *We may ſit*, or ſitting is a lawfull geſture. In which ſence now vnderſtand you this Propoſition? In the firſt? Then I deny it, and ſay *Sitting is not the onely lawfull geſture.* In the ſecond? Then I anſwer two things. Firſt you haue ill expreſt your ſelfe, vſing words that beare not your meaning: for *Wee ought*, imports a neceſſary duty, and *Wee may*, free choice and liberty. Secondly I diſtinguiſh. For if you vnderſtand it Abſolutely and Simply in it ſelfe, then I grant *Wee may ſit*, for ſitting is indifferent and ſo there ſhall bee no controuerſie betwixt vs. But if you vnderſtand it reſpectiuely and with regard vnto the Canons and conſtitutions of the Church, then I ſay wee may not ſit: for the Church, vnto whom wee owe obedience, hath ordained otherwiſe.

Againe, I ſuſpect thoſe words, *at the receiuing of the Elements of the Lords Supper:* for why doe you not ſay rather, *at the receiuing of the Body and Blood of our Lord*

and

and Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt? eſpecially ſeeing this is the nobler part of the Sacrament, and the Elements are but ſhadowes of this ſubſtance. Was it, leſt ſitting might ſeeme too perfunctory, and kneeling neuer a whit too reuerent for ſo ſacred an action? If ſo, then are you guilty of no ſmall fault, thus to ſleight the holy Sacrament for ſo poore an aduantage. But perhaps it was done out of ſimplicity, rather then cunning. Howbeit taking vpon you to play the Logician and to diſpute Syllogiſtically, you ought to haue been more wary of your tearmes. And ſo I paſſe vnto your arguments, the firſt whereof is thus framed.

1 *A comely geſture ought to be vſed.* 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. *Sitting is a comely geſture: (for the affection of ioy muſt then bee ſtirred vp, with which it agrees. Mar.* 14. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26. *Ergo, ſitting ought to bee vſed.*

This is rather a Paralogiſme then Syllogiſme: for the Propoſitions are indefinite, and of no quantity, and out of ſuch Propoſitions nothing can Logically bee concluded. But I will help to rectify your Syllogiſme, if firſt I may know what you would conclude. The Concluſion muſt needs bee one of two, either this, *Wee may ſit*, or this, *Wee muſt ſit*. Would you conclude, *Wee may ſit*, in the ſence aboue denied? (for ſo you ought), Then muſt it thus bee formed, *Any comely geſture may be vſed notwithſtanding the Churches ordinance: ſitting is a comely geſture: Ergo, ſitting may bee vſed notwithſtanding the Churches ordinance.* But ſo the Maior is vntrue. For Magiſtrates haue authority to order things indifferent, as

they find it expedient, to auoid confuſion, and to ſettle an vniformity: and wee are bound not onely for feare, Rom. 13. 5. but alſo for Conſcience to obey. Neither doth the paſſage you quote for proofe of your Maior, euince the contrary. For *Saint Paul* commanding that *all things bee done decently*, permitteth not euery one to vſe his liberty as hee liſteth, but ſetteth bounds vnto vs rather, as *Caluin* In. 1. Cor. 14. 40. ſaith & eſtabliſheth the lawfull orders of the Church: ſeeing it cannot bee decent to affront authority, and doe as we pleaſe.

But it may bee you would conclude that wee *muſt ſit*, or that *ſitting is the onely lawfull geſture*. Then muſt your argument bee thus framed, *A comely geſture onely is to bee vſed: ſitting onely is comely: Ergo, ſitting onely is to bee vſed*. The Maior whereof I grant, and acknowledge to bee ſufficiently prooued: but I deny the Minor. For if ſitting bee the onely comely geſture, then is not onely the Church of *England* to bee condemned for kneeling, but ſundry other reformed Churches alſo for ſtanding, yea our Sauiour himſelfe with all his Apoſtles, who (as in due place ſhall bee demonſtrated) *ſate not*: to ſay nothing, that it is your ſingular opinion, and that the man cannot bee named who held the ſame beford you, or holds it beſides you.

For as for your reaſon, that *ſitting agrees with the affection of ioy, which then muſt bee ſtirred vp*, it is a very ſtrange and vnreaſonable one. For firſt, bee it that ioy muſt then bee ſtirred vp: ſo muſt humility, reuerence, thankfulneſſe alſo. And therefore if ſitting bee comely becauſe it agreeth with the one: Kneeling alſo is comely, becauſe it agreeth with the other. Againe, ſuppoſe that ſitting agree with Ioy: ſo doth leaping, dancing, exultation.

tion also. Why then if Sitting by vertue of this agreement be comely, are not the rest in like manner comely? Lastly, that *Sitting* is the *emblem of Rest* and that such posture of the body is fit for study, counsell, meditation, I haue often heard: and so much is meant by those old sayings, *The Romans conquer by sitting*, and *By sitting men become wise*. But how it *agreeth with the affection of ioy*, neither doe you shew it, neither can you: and therefore I leaue it as a fancy, vnkith vnkist, as they say, and passe to your second argument, which you conceiue in this forme. Argum.

2 *Gesture according to order must be vsed.* 1 Cor. 14. 40.
Sitting is an orderly gesture: for Christ and his Apostles sate, so did the Iewes also eating the Passeouer.
Ergo Sitting must bee vsed.

This argument is euery way twin vnto the former, and in a manner needs no other answer then is already giuen. Neuertheless, for fuller satisfaction let vs examine both the Propositions. The Maior being rightly vnderstood I grant: for no gesture may be vsed but that which is orderly, it being the Apostles expresse commandement in the place by you alledged, that *all things bee done decently and according vnto order*. I say, being rightly vnderstood: for there is a double Order, the one Intrinsecall & in the things thē selues, the other Externall & vnto vs. The former is that *habitude, disposition, or correspōdence* which one thing naturally hath vnto another: in regard whereof it may also be called a Physicall order or an order of Nature. The latter is that which is made so vnto vs, being prescribed by lawfull authority: in respect.

pect whereof it may further bee tearmed, *a morall order, or an order of Prudence.* Now if you vnderſtand your Maior thus, No geſture muſt be vſed but that which is at leaſt one of theſe two wayes orderly, you vnderſtand it aright: for ſo is S. *Pauls* meaning, and in that ſence it is granted vnto you. But if you vnderſtand it thus, that any geſture which is in it ſelfe orderly may indifferently bee vſed by any, albeit the Church haue for orders ſake among many ſuch choſen out, and authorized one only: then doe you miſunderſtand it, and it is denied you: for S. *Paul* both here and elſewhere plainely declares himſelfe to bee a great enemy vnto all ſuch Anarchicall diſorder and confuſion.

Your *Minor* is, that *Sitting is an orderlie geſture.* Whereunto I anſwere, that it is ſo indeed in it ſelfe, there being a naturall aptnes and fitnes in it to be vſed at the receiving of the *Sacrament* yet is it not in this ſence the only orderlie geſture: for Standing and Kneeling are ſo alſo, and may put in for a place as well as Sitting. Neither is it vnto vs orderlie, becauſe publick authority hath commanded Kneeling onely, which to diſobey, is, as S. *Paul* ſaith, *to reſiſt the ordinance of God.* Nor doth the example and practice of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and the Iewes proue the contrary. For the geſture they vſed, as it was orderly in it ſelfe, ſo was it generally received and approved by the Church at that time: but among vs not Sitting but Kneeling is the geſture that is allowed and enioyned.

But if, this notwithſtanding, you will needs have that geſture orderly vnto vs now which Chriſt and his Apoſtles, vſed, becauſe it was at that time orderlie, vnto them: then know their geſture was not Sitting, and you bewray

bewray your ſelfe to bee but a bad Antiquary in affirming it. For as all ſtory teſtifieth, it was the manner of thoſe times and long before, at meales to lie on their beds, leaning on their elbowes, and ſupporting themſelues with pillowes. And hereunto agree the words which the *Euangeliſts* vſe to expreſſe their geſture: for ἀνάκειμαι in *Mathew and Marke*, and ἀναπίπτω in *Luke and Iohn*, import no other then lying at the table. Neither can you otherwiſe vnderſtand that which is ſaid of him whom Chriſt loued, that at ſupper *hee lay* or *leaned on Ieſus breaſt*, vnles it be by this geſture. Wherfore you muſt of force either quit Sitting, and vrge vpon vs a neceſſity of lying: or acknowledge that Sitting may not bee orderly vnto us, though anciently vnto Chriſt and his Apoſtles it were ſo. Your third and laſt argument is.

q. or Couches. or long mattreſſes lying on the floore

S. Io:

3. *If ſitting bee the only warranted geſture by Gods word, then it ought only to be vſed.* (3) Scriptu.
But it is the only warranted geſture: for it only was vſed by the Iewes at the Paſſeover, and by Chriſt & his Apoſtles at his Supper.
Ergo ſitting only is to be vſed.

That the word written (for ſo you meane) is the only warrant of all actions; is more then you will euer be able to proue. For the law of nature written in the hart, and the light of reaſon are ſufficient warrants for many things. Otherwiſe, how could the Gentiles which had not the law written, be as S. *Paul* ſaith *a law vnto themſelves?* and how could their conſciences either accuſe them for breaking the law, or excuſe them for doing thereafter? Neither do I herein derogate ought from Scripture:

Scripture: only I yeeld vnto Reaſon that which is her due. They are both from God, and both are to be our directors: the one in thoſe things that fall within the compaſſe of nature, the other in thoſe things that are aboue nature. In things ſupernaturall Scripture is the only warrant, Reaſon being therein ſtarkblind: In things Morall it is the ſafeſt warrant, Reaſon therein being but dimſighted. But to make Scripture the only warrant in all things without exception, is to put out the ſight of Reaſon, and to make it ſtarke blind in euery thing. Scripture I confeſſe is perfect, but as a creature perfect in its kinde. Whatſoeuer is neceſſarie vnto that end whereto it was ordained, namely *to make the man of God wiſe vnto Saluation*, it containeth abundantlie, and with *Tertullian, I adore the fulnes thereof*. Other things if it warrant not, it no way impeacheth the perfection thereof, becauſe they are impertinent and make not vnto the end thereof. The ſequele therefore of your Maior is not good, and it is abſurd and idle, in things not neceſſary to ſaluation to argue, from authority of Scripture negatiuely, it ſaith not ſo *Ergo* it is not ſo.

2. Tim. 3. 15.

Contra. Hermog. c. 22.

But ſuppoſing the Conſequence of your Maior to be good, how proue you the Minor, that Sitting is onely warranted by Gods word? Forſooth, *becauſe it onely was vſed by the Iewes at the Paſſeouer, and by Chriſt and his Apoſtles at his Supper*. Firſt I haue ſufficiently demonſtrated aboue, that they ſate not: and therefore Sitting is ſo farre from being only warranted, that by your rule it is not warranted at all. Secondly, grant they ſate, yet it followes not thereupon that Sitting only is warranted. For as for the Iewes, neither do their Ceremonies concerne us, and at the firſt it ſeemes they ſtood. For they

Ex. 12. 11.

were

were commanded to eat the *Passeouer, with their loines girt, their shoes on their feet, & their staues in their hands, and in hast*: and, as they were commanded, so they did. v. 25.
As touching Christ and his Apostles, their act indeed (Supposing they sate.)
sufficiently proues that Sitting is in it selfe, and was vnto them lawfull, seing the wisedome of Christ otherwise, would not haue vsed it: but that it is the onely lawfull gesture it cannot possibly prooue. If it could, by the same reason it would follow that the *Eucharist* is only to bee administred at euening and after supper, because Christ then administred it. For they are both circumstances, and not essentiall: *& idem ius Titio quod Sejo*, there is the same reason of both.

You will yet happily demand, why wee make not Christs gesture a precedent for ours? are we wiser then Christ? And I againe demand of you, why you lie not on your beds as Christ did: know you what is conuenient better then he? your answer I suppose will be, that Christs gesture, was that which ordinarily they then vsed at meales: and Sitting is that which ordinarily they now vse. And I answer, because wee receiue not the Sacrament with our meales, as Christ and his Apostles first did, therefore do we not vse the gesture of meales. The cause of the gesture being taken away, the gesture it selfe may bee changed also. The Iewes at the first ate the Passeouer standing, as wee haue shewed, to signifie their hastie departure out of *Egypt*: but being now safely escaped thence, they alter that gesture, and our Sauiour Cap. 28.
by his practice approues their so doeing. The Councels Cap. 74.
of *Laodicea*, and of *Trullo* forbidding *Agapas*, that is, the loue feasts, with which they were wont to receive the Communion, forbad also *accubitus sternere* to lie any more

more in the Churches vpon their beds. So that in the wiſdome of the Churches of both Teſtaments, ſuch circumſtances may iuſtly bee varied as the cauſes or reaſons of them doe vary.

And thus of your arguments for ſitting; now let vs take a view alſo of your reaſons againſt Kneeling. They are in number foure, all as you thinke demonſtratiue, and out of neceſſary premiſſes concluding, that we may at no hand Kneele. The firſt is this:

1 *If Kneeling ought to bee vſed, then it is conuenient. But it is not conuenient. 2Chron. 6. 13. Dan. 6. 11. Ergo, it is not to be vſed.*

The Maior of this Syllogiſme is *Hypothetical* or *Conditionall*, the *Conſequence* whereof is grounded vpon this *Categorical*, or *ſimple Propoſition*. Nothing ought to be
Rom. 3. 8. vſed but that which is conuenient. Whereunto I anſwer, firſt, as we may not doe euill that good may come of it: ſo neither may we forbeare that good which is commanded vs for any euill or inconuenience that may follow thereof. Secondly, in things indifferent which are neither good nor euill, if they bee not ordered by authority, but are ſtill arbitrary and left vnto our choice, then as wee may vſe them becauſe they are lawfull, ſo may wee not vſe them when they proue inexpedient. The rule of charity muſt ouerrule vs in this caſe. But if once they bee ordered by publicke authority, then neceſſity is laid vpon vs, and wee muſt conforme our ſelues vnto order notwithſtanding any pretended inconuenience. The rule of loyalty muſt ſway with vs in this caſe. Bee it then that *Kneeling is inconuenient*, it was the fault of our ſuperiors.

riors to command it. Now it is commanded, and it is our duty to obey them. If it bee inconuenient to Kneele: it is more inconuenient to disobey, and for not Kneeling to bee barred from the Sacrament. The sequele therefore of your Maior is not good, and I require you to proue it.

The Assumption is, *Kneeling is not conuenient*. I deny it. You proue it by two places of Scripture, which testify that *Salomon* & *Daniel* kneeled when they prayed. The weaknesse of which proofe that you may the more readily perceiue, I reduce it into forme, thus. *That gesture which is vsed in prayer, is not conuenient at the Sacrament. But Kneeling is a gesture vsed in Prayer. Ergo, it is inconuenient at the Sacrament.* The Minor, whereof I grant: but I deny the Maior as being too palpably absurd. For first, neuer man yet dreamed that Kneeling is *proper quarto modo* vnto it, and may not bee vsed in any other action. Secondly, then may wee neither sit nor stand at the Sacrament, because *Elias* prayed sitting and the *Publican* standing: yea happily no gesture is left for the Sacrament, seeing Prayer hath ingrost them all before hand. Lastly, for as much as at the time of receiuing our affections are to bee aduanced and lifted vp vnto God in prayer and thankesgiuing: it must needs be by your owne rule, that Kneeling is a gesture euery way conuenient for it. Your second argument is,

1 King. 19.4.
Luc. 18. 13.

2 *No will-worship may bee vsed. Mat. 15. 9.*
Kneeling is will-worship: for Pope Honorius first deuised it. Acts & Mon. pag. 1390.
Ergo, Kneeling may not bee vsed.

To yeeld vnto God that Worship which he himselfe

hath reuealed and preſcribed, is an Act of true deuotion: but to obtrude and thruſt vpon him a Worſhip forged and deuiſed of our ſelues, is meere ſuperſtition. The one hee rigourouſly exacteth of vs; the other hee expreſly forbiddeth. In the law God commandeth the Iewes to make them fringes in the borders of their garments, and to put a blew ribband vpon it throughout their generations, *that yee may looke vpon it*, ſaith he, *and remember all the Commandements of the Lord to doe them: and that yee ſeeke not after your owne heart, and your owne eyes after whichyee vſe to goe a whoaring*. In the Prophets, he often-times vpbraideth them with their owne inuentions, and diſdainfully ſaith vnto them, *who hath required theſe things at your hands?* And in the new Teſtament, our Sauiour in the place by you quoted, ſeuerely taxeth the *Phariſees*, for teaching their owne fantaſies, and placing the worſhip of God in the obſeruation of mens precepts: and Saint *Paul* to the *Coloſſians* in plaine tearmes condemneth this deuotion, *Wil-worſhip*, notwithſtading whatſoeuer ſhew of Wiſdome or humility it carry with it. Ex. 15. 38. 39. Mat. 15. 9. Col. 2. 23.

All which conſidered, I yeeld you your Maior as true, *No Wil-worſhip may be vſed.*

Your Aſſumption that *Kneeling is Wil-worſhip* I deny: telling you further that you doe intolerable wrong vnto the Church of *England*, charging her with ſo groſſe a Superſtition. For the world knoweth, and you muſt needs be a great ſtranger in *Iſrael* if you be ignorant, that the Gouernors of our Church preſſe not their ceremonies vpon the conſciences of men, as if they were in themſelues neceſſary and not indifferent: neither place any part of Religion or diuine worſhip in them. This they leaue vnto that *Man of ſin*, who challengeth power vnto him-

himselfe, as to create new articles of faith, so to prescribe new formes of Worship also. That their intent is not Wil-worship, but order & vniformity, they haue oftentimes published, if I may so say, with sound of trumpet: which if you haue not heard, it is extreme deafenes: if you haue heard, and yet will not bee satisfied, to say no more, it proceeds of meere wilfulnes and frowardnesse.

Howbeit to proue your Minor you affirme that Pope *Honorius* first deuised it. It is true indeed that *Honorius* the third decreed, that Priests should often teach their people, reuerently to bow themselues at the Eleuation of the Hoste when Masse is said, and when the Priest carries it to one that is sicke, and I deny not but thereby he intended the Adoration of the Hoste. But you should know that it is one thing to receiue the Communion Kneeling, another thing to Kneele at the Eleuation when there is no Receiuing. This *Honorius* decreed, not that, for ought I can learne. Nay further, what that gesture was which succeeded *accubitus*, *lying on beds*, whether it were kneeling, or standing, or sitting, I suppose he who is well acquainted with Ecclesiasticall Story can hardly determine, much lesse you whose reading therein passeth not beyond the booke of Martyrs. Let euery one herein abound in his owne sence: I for my part thinke it was Kneeling rather then any other, because it is a gesture of most reuerence. *Hospinian* a learned man who wrote the story of this Sacrament, hath these words, *This Sacrament ought to bee handled with great Religion and reuerence, according to the custome of euery Church, with decent apparell, temperate behauiour, soberly, religiously, the head bare, the knees bent, and other such like free ceremonies. And this reuerence or honour I doubt not but*

Cap. Sane, de celebr. Miss.

Lib. 4. c. 8.

ſome of the Fathers aboue cited vnderſtood by the word Adoration. For to Adore ſometime ſignifieth, as all know, externall reuerence and veneration exhibited by bodily geſtures and ſpeech vnto a thing, as when the knees are bent, the body is bowed, the head vncouered, the hands lifted vp, &c. Thus far *Hoſpinian*, by whoſe iudgement Kneeling in all likely-hood was vſed long before *Honorius* liued, or the *Reall Preſence* was dreamed of. Howſoeuer, it is meere toppery to imagine that a thing in it ſelfe lawfull once abuſed to a bad end, can neuer recouer its right againe and bee lawfully vſed: and then taking this for granted, to preiudice our reuerent receiuing by Romiſh practice and ſuperſtition. I conclude therefore this point with that excellent ſaying of *Origen*, *when thou receiueſt that holy meat and incorruptible banket, when thou enioyeſt that Bread and Cup of life, and eateſt and drinkeſt the Body and Bloud of the Lord, then the Lord entreth vnder thy roofe. Thou therefore humbling thy ſelfe, imitate the Centurion and ſay, Lord I am not worthy that thou ſhouldſt come vnder my roofe.* The third argument.

Hom. 5. in Euang.

3 *All ſhew of euill muſt bee eſchewed.* 1. *Theſſ.* 5. 22.
Kneeling is a ſhew of euill, as of Bread worſhip.
Ergo, Kneeling muſt bee eſchewed.

Firſt I interprete the Maior. Saint *Pauls* words in the place by you quoted are theſe, Ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε: which may bee rendred thus, *Abſtaine from all kind of euill.* For the word εἶδος ſignifieth kinde: and in this ſence the *Syriacke* tranſlation vnderſtandeth it. And interpreting it thus, the Maior is vniuerſally and without exception true: for no euill whatſoeuer, being intrinſecally

trinſecally and formally ſo, may in any caſe bee done. Beſides this expoſition there is another more generally approued, *Abſtaine from all ſhew of euill or euill ſhew.* For as euill it ſelfe muſt bee refrained that God bee not offended nor our Conſciences diſquieted: ſo muſt ſhew of euill alſo bee auoided, that wee ſcandall not our brother, nor diſcredit our profeſſion. But in this ſence the Maior is not vniuerſally and without exception true. For firſt, it holds not in neceſſary duties commanded by God, nor in things indifferent ordered by man. For the ſubſtance muſt not bee neglected becauſe of a ſhadow: nor wee fall into the reall euils of Diſobedience and Diſloyalty, to auoid the ſhew of euill. Againe it holds not in Imaginary ſhewes, ſuch as are without ground fancied in the ſicke braines of humorous and malecontented people: but ſuch onely as indeed carry with them a ſhrewd preſumption of that euill whereof it is a ſhew. And thus the Maior is granted vnto you, in the former ſence abſolutely and ſimply, in the latter reſpectiuely with theſe reſtrictions and limitations.

Now to the Minor I anſwere, firſt Kneeling is not formally euill, but of an indifferent and middle nature, neither good nor euill: and therefore is not forbidden by the former interpretation, *Abſtaine from all kind of euill.* Secondly, I denie it to bee *a ſhew of euill.* For whereof? Of *Bread worſhip* you ſay. How ſo, ſeing we are neither *Tranſubſtantiators* nor *Conſubſtantiators*, and haue long ſince openly before all men diſclaimed both *Eleuation & Adoration?* And to whom? To Papiſt or Proteſtant? Certainly neither: for the one condemnes vs for not adoring, and the other ſuſpects vs not for adoring. So that the *Shew of Breadworſhip* lieth not in our Kneeling,

Kneeling, but in your Imagination. Which if it be a ſufficient reaſon to barre vs from Kneeling, I muſt entreat you for the ſame reaſon to abſtaine from Sitting: for I can eaſily imagine in it a ſhew of euill, namely of Sleighting and Contemning the Sacrament. Nay I muſt pray you to ſit ſtill and do nothing: for what is it wherein a man may not fancie ſome euill ſhew or other? Laſtly, ſuppoſe Kneeling haue the ſhew you ſpeake of, yet is it not to be forborne, becauſe it is in the number of thoſe things that are excepted from the generall rule. For it is commanded by authority; and to receiue the Communion is a neceſſary duty which among us without Kneeling cannot bee done. Now as I haue ſaid, to auoid ſeeming euill we may not be euill, and for feare of a ſhadow looſe the ſubſtance; I meane the benefit and comfort of the Sacrament. And thus your argument drawen from the ſhew of euill proues as you ſee but the ſhew of an argument. I come to the laſt reaſon.

See Tertull. de orat. c. 12.

4 *If we may kneele to Bread and wine, much more may We kneele to Angels.*
But wee may not kneele to Angels. Rev. 19. 10.
Ergo wee may not kneele to bread and wine.

This is that *Fallacie* which *Logicians* call *Ignorance of the Elench*, when that is concluded which is not in queſtion. For our Queſtion is, *Whether we may kneele at the receauing of the Sacrament*: but your *Concluſion is wee may not kneele to Bread and Wine.* Neither ſhall there bee any quarell betweene vs about this point: for we readily grant it you, acknowledging further that your argument from

from the greater to the leſſe ſufficiently euinceth it. For if we may not fall downe to adore an Angell, much leſſe may we do ſo to bread and wine. And as we may not, ſo wee do not. Our Kneeling is not intended unto bread and wine, but vnto God who in the Sacrament offereth vnto vs the bleſſed body and bloud of his ſonne, who is God alſo, and to bee worſhipped of vs for euermore. You might therefore well haue forborne this argument which neither preiudiceth vs, nor aduantageth your ſelfe any whit at all: or if you haue any other meaning, you ſhould haue better expreſt it. For my part I cannot gueſſe what it ſhould bee, nor will I trouble my braine in ſeeking it. Happily your ſelfe know not what you would.

And thus haue I though breefly, yet fully anſwered all your reaſons. It now remaineth, that either you produce ſounder arguments then yet you haue giuen vs, or adde more vigor and ſtrength vnto theſe: or (becauſe I feare you can do neither) that conſidering the weaknes of thoſe reeds whereon you haue hitherto leaned, hence forward you truſt them no more. It can bee no diſgrace vnto you to bee ouercome of Truth: neither is it leuity or inconſtancy vpon ſight of your errour to change both your opinion and practice. Take therefore vnto you Chriſtian ſeuerity, and ingenuouſly reuoke what you haue held or done amiſſe: ſo ſhall you giue glorie vnto God, and God ſhall honour you in the ſight of all his Saints. But if, notwithſtanding all that hath beene ſaid, you meane ſtill to perſiſt in your error, and will not bee perſuaded although you be perſwaded: I feare leſt after ſtraining at theſe gnats, you fall to ſwallowing downe of Camels, and proceed from diſlike of a few

indifferent ceremonies, vnto flat schisme and separation. which God forbid for his mercies sake. Amen.

See T de ors:

To receive the blessed Sacram^t upon our Knees, in y^e Conscience is the most humble, most devout, & most agreeable posture for y^e holy duties. Notwithstanding some men, upon Reasons best (if not only) known to themselves, choose rather to do it sitting or standing. K. Ch. & Declar^s of Church affairs. p. 102. A generall Synod to be called shortly to order & determine all these=

K. C. We are glad to finde, that All, with whome we have conferred (and they are very many of seuerall Countryes & Nations) do in their Judgm^t approue a Liturgy, or Set form of Publick Worsh. to be lawfull, nay in our Judgm^t, for the p^reseruation of Vnity & Vniformity We conceive to be very necessary. ibid. p. 98.//

We do esteeme the Liturgy of the Church of Engl: contayned in the booke of Com: prayer, and by Law established, to be the best we have seen: And we believe that We have seen all that are extant and used in this part of the world; and will know what reverence most of the Reformed Churches, or at least, the most learned men in those Churches have for it &c. ibid: p. 98. 99.//

HOW

HOW S. PAVL AND S. IAMES ARE TO BEE reconciled in the matter of IVSTIFICATION.

YOV demand how Saint *Paul* teaching *Iustification* by Faith onely without the Works of the Law, aud Saint *James* affirming that of Works a man is iustified and not of Faith only, may bee reconciled. I will endeuour to giue you the best satisfaction I can in a few Propositions. Ro. 5. 20, 28. Gal. 2. 16. Iam. 2. 24.

1 Scripture being the Word of God who is truth and whose promises are not *yea and nay*, but *yea and Amen*, although sometime there may seeme contrariety in it, yet reall difference and repugnancy there can bee 2. Cor. 1. 17, 18. 19. 20.

none, truth euer agreeing and neuer contradicting it ſelfe.

2 *Paul* therefore and *Iames* being inſpired by the ſame ſpirit muſt needs conſpire in the ſame truth: although the one exclude Works from Faith in the matter of *Iuſtification*, the other include Works together with Faith.

3 The readieſt way to reconcile this ſeeming contradiction is to obſerue carefully the Occaſions whereupon they were moued to deliuer theſe doctrines, and to diſtinguiſh the Equiuocation and diuers vſe of theſe two words *Iuſtification* and *Faith*. For if there bee the ſame meaning in both, and no ambiguity in either of theſe tearmes, it cannot bee auoided but they muſt of neceſſity croſſe one the other.

4 *Saint Pauls* occaſion was this. Hee ſaw with what
Act. 15. 1. eagerneſſe & contention certaine Iewes maintained, that vnleſſe the law of *Moſes* were kept and obſerued together with the Goſpell, there could bee no *Iuſtification*: and that thereby mans Works were either ſubſtituted in the roome of, or yoked together with Faith, to the great
Ro. 2. 24. preiudice of Gods free Grace. And therefore againſt theſe he proues by the teſtimony of the Law & the Prophets, that we are *Iuſtified by Faith in Chriſt freely without the works of the Law.*

5 Hereupon ſome there were, who like ſpiders ſucking venome out of the wholſomeſt flowers, ſo interpreted this comfortable doctrine, as if it skilled not whether they practized good works, and led a godly & vertuous life, ſo as they did beleiue. And againſt this ſort of men the Apoſtle *Saint Iames* thought it neceſſary to oppoſe himſelfe.

6 So

6 So that *Saint Iames* doth not diſpute againſt *Saint Paul*, but for the right meaning of *S. Paul* againſt thoſe that depraued and wreſted his doctrine to a wrong ſence. *Paul* ſo defending *Iuſtification by Faith without Works*, as hee denies not the neceſſary practice of them, but only denies the power of *Iuſtification* vnto them: *Iames* ſo eſtabliſhing good Works, not as giuing them force to make a man acceptable and iuſt in the ſight of Gods iuſtice, but onely diſabling that Faith from hauing any power to Iuſtify vs, which is not accompanied with them.

7 And thus *Saint Auguſtin* vnderſtandeth it. *When*, ſaith he, *the Apoſtle ſaith, that a man is iuſtified by Faith without the Works of the Law, hee meaneth not that Faith being receiued and profeſſed, the works of Iuſtice ſhould bee contemned: but that euery one ſhould know that he may be iuſtified by Faith, although the works of the law goe not before. For they follow him that is iuſtified, but goe not before him that is to bee iuſtified.* And againe, *When as Paul ſpeakes of the good works of Abraham which accompanied his Faith, it is manifeſt that by the example of Abraham he doth not ſo teach that a man is iuſtified by Faith without works, that if hee doe beliue it concernes him not to worke well: but to to this end rather, that no man ſhould thinke that by the merit of his former good Works he hath attained the gift of iuſtification which is by Faith.* De fide & oper. l. 1. c. 14. 83. quæſt. q. 16.

8 As the conſideration of the different occaſions which moued theſe two Apoſtles to ſpeake ſo differently doth in part cleere this queſtion: ſo will it yet bee more euident if wee know the ſeuerall acceptions and vſes of theſe words *Iuſtification* and *Faith*, and in what ſence either Apoſtle vnderſtands them.

9 *Iuſtification* vſually in the Scripture phraſe ſignifieth, not to make iuſt by infuſing the quality of Iuſtice into the ſoule, but *to pronounce and declare to be iuſt*: being indeed a Law-terme, and drawne from ciuill Courts of iudicature, and is oppoſed to *Condemnation*. And this is ſo cleere, that *Tolet* a Ieſuite confeſſeth it moſt frequently ſo to ſignify in Scripture: *Pineda*, *Vega*, and *Salmeron* three great Papiſts acknowledge it in this ſence to be vſed by S. *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, where hee diſputeth purpoſely of *Iuſtification*.

2. King. 15. 4. Deut. 25. 1. Pſal. 81. 3. Prov. 17. 15. Mat. 12. 37. Ro. 8. 33. 34.

10 Now there is a double tribunall where wee are to bee iudged, one is Gods, the other Mans: and therefore God is ſayd to Iuſtify, and Man alſo. God when he acquits a ſinner from his ſinnes for the merit of his Son Chriſt: Man when ſeeing our good works (which are the fruites and teſtimonies of our grace with God) out of the iudgement of Charity hee accounts vs the Sonnes of God. Of the former Saint *Paul* ſpeakes, of the latter S. *Iames*. S. *Paul* enquireth how wee are made Iuſt before God, namely by Faith: S. *Iames* how it may appeare vnto men that wee are Iuſt, namely by Works. Faith is the principle of Exiſtence by which we are Iuſt: Works of Knowledge by which we are knowne to be Iuſt.

Iac. 2. 18. In id cap.

11 That Saint *Iames* vnderſtandeth ſuch a *Declaratiue Iuſtification* is plaine by that he ſaith. *Shew mee thy Faith by thy Works?* And *Thomas of Aquin* affirmeth, that Workes following Faith are not ſaid to Iuſtify, as Iuſtification is an infuſion of iuſtice but as it is an exerciſe or declaration or perfection of Faith.

12 Concerning the word Faith, ſometimes it ſignifieth that ſanctifying grace of Gods ſpirit whereby wee beleeue

beleeue in or on God, that is, put all our affiance vpon God in Chriſt for Iuſtification and Saluation: ſometimes a naked aſſent or agreeing to all the truths contained in the Scripture, ſpecially ſuch as are Euangelicall. That is only of the Elect: this the Diuels haue. That either hath works following it, as in *Abraham*: or is great in child of works, ready to trauell and bring forth if God giue time, as in the theefe on the croſſe. This many times is without works, and therefore dead and ſpiritles. Of that S. *Paul* ſpeaketh: of this S. *Iames*. That ſole but not ſolitary iuſtifies: this being ſolitary iuſtifies not.

13 In a word, S. *Paul* ſpeaks of the cauſe of Iuſtification: S. *Iames* of the Effect. S. *Paul* deſcends from the Cauſe to the Effect: S. *Iames* aſcends from the Effects to the Cauſe. S. *Paul* reſolues how wee may bee iuſtified: S. *Iames* how wee may bee knowne to bee iuſtified. S. *Paul* excludes works as being no Cauſe of Iuſtification: S. *Iames* requires works as fruites of Iuſtification. S. *Paul* denies works to go before them that are to bee iuſtified: S. *Iames* affirmeth that they follow him that is iuſtified.

14 Others diſtinguiſh, and reconcile them thus. Iuſtification is ſometime vnderſtood without implying Sanctification, ſometime as it implyeth alſo Sanctification with it. In the former ſence S. *Paul* taketh it, when hee proueth that a man is iuſtified by Faith without works: S. *Iames* in the latter, when he concludeth that a man is iuſtified by works and not by Faith only. And this I ſuppoſe to be a very ſound interpretation.

15 Howſoeuer, that Faith alone without the works of the Law in the ſence aboue deliuered doth iuſtifie, theſe

these ancient Fathers auouch together with us, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Eusebius Cæsariensis*, *Hilarie*, *Basil*, *Chrysostome*, *Ambrose*, *Augustin*, *Cyril*, *Primasius*, *Hesychius*, *Gennadius*, *Oecumenius*, whose direct and expresse words I can at any time produce. Nay these late Papists also (least it should be thought that none but Protestants hold it) the *Canons of Collein*, the authors of the booke offered by *Cæsar* vnto the *Protestant Collocutors* in the assemblie of *Ratisbon*, *Pighius*, *Cassander*, *Stapulensis*, *Peraldus*, *Ferus*, and others who count themselues as good Catholiks as they that hold otherwise.

16 And this only Faith is so sure an anchor of our soules, and such a fountaine of true comfort both in life and death, that Charles the fift, *Steuen Gardiner*, *Sir Christopher Blunt*, and sundrie others durst not at their death trust vnto their works, but vnto Faith in Christ only. And *Cardinal Bellarmin* after a long disputation touching the merit of works is faine to conclude, that because of the vncertenty of our owne iustice, and the danger of vaineglory, the Safest course is to repose all our affiance in the only mercy and goodnes of God. So that in his iudgement wee Protestants haue chosen the Safest course: & I for my part will neuer trust my soule vnto them who leauing so safe a course, meane to hazard it through a more dangerous way.

OF

OF THE AVTHORS AND AVTHORITY OF THE CREED.

AND WHY IT IS CALLED a Symbole.

THe inſcription of the Creed ſeemes to father it on the holy Apoſtles, calling it the Symbole of the Apoſtles. So doe almoſt all the Fathers of the fourth age after Chriſt and downeward, affirming that the Apoſtles hauing receiued the Holy Ghoſt at *Ieruſalem*, and being now ready to diſperſe themſelues into all parts of the world to preach the

Goſpell, thought it good before their parting to compile this Symbole, that it might ſerue as a pledge of their vnity in the Faith, and a canon for their doctrine and teaching. Yea ſome of them proceed ſo farre as particularly to ſet downe what article was made by what Apoſtle: whereof ſee *Auguſtin* in his hundred and fifteenth Sermon *de tempore*. Now although it bee very hard for mee to ſway againſt the ſtreame of ſo maine authority: yet can I not but doubt thereof, and confeſſe with *Eraſmus* I know not who made the Creed, eſpecially hauing ſo great probabilities (for demonſtrations I dare not call them) that it ſhould not bee done by the twelue Apoſtles.

Paraphr. in Mat. Præf.

For firſt, were it compiled by them, is it likely that Saint *Luke* writing the hiſtory of their Acts, would haue omitted ſo principall a matter? Sundry other things of farre leſſe conſequence hee hath carefully recorded: but of this ſo important and weighty a buſineſſe hee makes not ſo much as one word mention, which certainly hee would neuer haue failed to doe, had they done ſo. Adde hereunto that not one of the ancient Fathers who liued within the three firſt *Centuries of Chriſt* ſpeake of any ſuch thing in any of their writings: and yet they ſhould beſt know it whoſe times were neereſt vnto the Apoſtles. This deep ſilence both of Saint *Luke* and all thoſe ancient Doctors, make it vnto mee more then probable that the Apoſtles neuer compoſed it.

Secondly, as the ſilence of theſe worthies, ſo the very language of the Creed conuinceth it to bee yonger then the Apoſtles. For the word Catholike vſed in the Creed was not knowne in their time. Can any man thinke that the Church ſhould then bee called Catholike when it

was

was not Catholike? For when they say this Creed was compiled, the Church was scarce begunne among the Iewes, and the Apostles had no where as yet preached the Gospell among the Gentils. But heare the expresse words of *Pacianus Bishop of Barcilona, Sed sub Apostolis, inquies, nemo Catholicus vocabatur. Esto, sic fuerit. Vel illud indulge, cum post Apostolos hæreses extitissent, diuersisq; nominibus columbam Dei atq; Reginam lacerare per partes & scindere niterentur: nonne cognomen suum plebs Apostolica postulabat, quo incorrupti populi distingueret vnitatem, ne intemeratam Dei virginem error aliquorum per membra laceraret?* In the Apostles times, you will say, no man was called Catholicke. Bee it so. Yet by your leaue when after the Apostles heresies were risen vp, and by diuersity of names they laboured to rent and teare in peeces the doue and queene of God: was it not requisite that those which were Apostolike should haue a sirname of their owne, whereby the vnity of those that are vncorrupt might bee distinguished, and the error of none might rent in peeces the immaculate virgin of God? Thus hee. Against which if it bee obiected, that the *Epistles of Iames, Peter, Iohn, and Inde* are called Catholicke: I answer, the Inscriptions and Subscriptions of the Epistles are not Apostolicall, but added to them by some other, and sometime vntruly. Neither is there any reason they should bee so stiled aboue the rest. For neither is the doctrine contained in them more Catholicke then of all the other Epistles, neither were they written to all the *Iewes*, more then the Epistle to the *Hebrewes*, neither were they all written to all Catholicks, for the second and third of *Iohn* were sent vnto priuate persons onely, and all the rest as vniuersally concerne all Ca- Ad Sympronian Epist. 1.

tholicks as these few tearmed Catholicke doe. I conclude therefore, the word Catholicke being latter then the Apostles, so must the Creed bee also which vses it.

Thirdly, the different relation of the story bewrayes the vncertainty of it: for they giue not all the same article vnto the same Apostle. Some marshall them iust as S. *Luke* doth in the first of the Acts: others thus, *Peter, Andrew, Iohn, Iames* the elder, *Thomas, Iames* the younger, *Bartlemew, Mathew, Simon, Iude, Matthias*. Againe, some of them attribute vnto *Peter* part onely of the first article, *I believe in God the Father almighty*, and vnto *Iohn* the other part *Maker of Heauen and Earth*. But others attribute the whole article vnto *Peter*, and giue another vnto *Iohn*. The like may bee obserued in other articles. If then they bee certaine of the tradition, why doe they differ thus in their reports? If they differ thus one from another, who can bee certaine of the tradition.

Fourthly, if the Creed both for matter & forme were from the Apostles, and they deliuered it precisely in those words in which we now haue it, why is it not placed in the Canon of Scripture? Certainly in the Church although it euer haue been much esteemed, yet was it neuer counted Canonicall. Neither hath it been preserued so safe from addition, detraction, mutation, as the rest of the Scriptures always haue been. For euen in the ancientest times we find great variety in it. *Ruffin* writing a iust comment on it, omits that clause *Maker of Heauen and Earth*. And who knowes not how many there are who relating this Creed leaue out the article of Christ descending into hell? Euen *Bellarmin* himselfe, confesseth

De Christ. anim. c. 6.

that

that it was not found anciently in all Creeds: and hee voucheth for it *Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, and Augustin* though fiue times he expoũd it, and finally the Creed of the *Roman Church* also as *Ruffin* witnesseth vnto whom if hee had been so pleased, he might haue added a whole armie of others, whom for breuities sake I omit. Finally the ancient Doctors were so farre from equalling it with Scripture, that they appealed from it thereunto as to an higher authority. *Cyril* plainely affirmeth that wee may not beleeue the Creed without Scripture. And *Paschasius* against *Macedonius* shrowding himselfe vnder some words of the Creed, appealeth vnto the Canonicall Scripture, for that of it, saith hee, the text of the Creed dependeth. Which had they thought it had been from the Apostles in such forme and as now we haue it, without question they neuer would haue done.

Catech. 4.

Bib'ioth. sanc. Patr. tom. 9.

Fiftly, the reason which they assigne why they composed this Creed, discouers the vanity thereof. What was that? That it might be forsooth vnto the Apostles a canon & rule, according to which they should square and conforme their preaching. What vnto the Apostles to whom Christ promised his blessed Spirit that should lead them into all truth? And that himselfe would put into their mouths a ready answer vpon all occasions, so that they should not need to bethinke themselues what to say? Could they possibly doubt lest any difference or discord should grow among them in matter of Faith, who were so guided by the Spirit of truth and vnity that they could not in any point either erre themselues, or lead any other into error? Surely, so to thinke, derogateth much from the truth of Christ, and imputeth much weakenesse vnto the Spirit of God, and detracteth from the certainty of

our Faith which dependeth on their preaching. So that for this cause it is vnlikely they made this Creed, at leastwise to this end.

De Symb. ad Cat. l. 1, c. 1. Lastly, Saint *Augustin* saith thus (not that false *Augustin* vpon whom those Sermons *de tempore* are fathered, and whose authority is vsually alledged to warrant this legend, but the true *S. Augustin* saith) *Illa verba (Symboli) quæ audiuisti is per Scripturas sparsa sunt, & inde collecta, & ad vnum redacta:* those words of the Creed which you haue heard, are dispersed through the Scriptures, and being gathered from thence, are reduced into one. With

De Spirit. Sanct. c. 1. him agreeth *Paschasius*, *De sacris omninò voluminibus quæ sunt credenda sumamus, de quorum fonte symboli ipsius series deriuata consistit:* Let vs take out of the sacred volumes what things wee are to beleiue, out of which fountaine the order of the Creed is deriued. And *Marcellus*

Centur. 1. l. 2. c. 4. a Bishop in a letter to *Iulius* Bishop of Rome professeth hauing rehearsed the words of the Creed, *Se hanc fidem ex Scripturis accepisse, & a maioribus secundum Deum accepisse, & eandem in Ecclesiâ Dei prædicare:* that he receiued this Faith out of the Scriptures, and next after God from his ancestors, and that hee preached it in the Church of God. If then, as these Fathers affirme, the Creed bee gathered out of the Scriptures, how can the Apostles bee authors thereof? For out of the old Testament they could not gather that Christ was borne of the Virgin *Mary*, or that hee suffered vnder *Pontius Pilate*. And as for the new, many of the Apostles were dead before all was written, and *Iames* before any was written: besides that no part of it was written when the Creed was compiled, if it bee true which the legend saith. And these are the reasons for which it seemeth vnto me more

then

then probable that the Apoſtles were neuer Authors of this Creed.

If it be ſo will ſome ſay, why doth it then beare the *Apoſtles* name? I anſwere, becauſe, as out of S. *Auguſtin* and others we haue ſhewed, the matter therein contayned is perfectly agreeable with the Apoſtles writings and was collected out of them. Moreouer, Apoſtolicall is a terme extended by writers vnto the firſt three hundred years after *Chriſt*. *Hæc ſola fides, ſaith Damaſus, quæ Nicææ Apoſtolorum authoritate fundata eſt, perpetua eſt firmitate ſeruanda*: this only Faith which was eſtabliſhed at Nice by the authority of the Apoſtles, is firmely and perpetually to be held. So *Scythianus* and *Terebinthus* are ſaid to haue liued *temporibus Apoſtolorum* in the time of the Apoſtles, who yet liued in *Aurelians* time, towards three hundred years after Chriſt. And *Iſidor* diſtinguiſhing betweene Apoſtles and the Firſt Apoſtles, ſaith that Apoſtles continued downe vntill *Pope Sylueſter*, and that the times before the great Counceil of Nice were Apoſtolicall. Although therefore the firſt Apoſtles were not the founders of this Creed: yet thoſe ſucceeding Apoſtles were, of whom it may be called the Apoſtles Creed. 6. Aug. Ep. 5. 5. Epiph. Hær. 66. 7.

Theſe things being ſo, let it bee obſerued thereupon, firſt how friuolouſly Papiſts cauill and quarell with vs, affirming that wee hold not the Faith of the Creed becauſe we queſtion it whether the Apoſtles were authors of it or no. As if to doubt of the author were to doubt of the truth of the matter: or as if all thoſe Ancients reiected the epiſtle to the *Hebrewes* for *Apocryphall*, which were not reſolued who wrote it, whether *Paul*, or *Barnabas*, or *Luke*, or *Clemens*. Secondly, how weaklie

Popiſh

Popish traditions are supported by the tradition of this Creed. For not being the Apostles, how can it be a tradition of the Apostles? or if it be a tradition of theirs, yet is it such a tradition as is written & contayned in Scripture: and such wee willingly receiue. Let them proue the rest of their pretended traditions to be such, and we will readily embrace them also. But returne wee to our purpose.

This Creed by whomsoeuer it was made is intituled Σύμβολον a *Symbol*: the reason whereof we are now to inquire. To let passe those barbarous and iocular notations which ignorant Monks haue giuen of it, lest relating them I should both spend time, & defile my paper: some deriue it from σύμβολον signifying as they say *a shote* or *reckoning*, for that the Apostles meeting together to compile it, did each conferre his article as it were his symbole for defraying of this heauenly banket. But first the Apostles, as we haue declared, neuer compiled this Creed. Secondly, if they compiled it, yet, as *Antonius Nebrissensis* saith, it is neither credible nor likely that each of them conferred his particle: seeing in those things that are constituted and decreed by many, it is not the manner for euery one seuerally to put his word or saying into it, but for all iointly to agree vpon the whole. Adde hereunto, that if it were so, men would neuer haue diuided the Creed as they haue done, some into seuen articles, because of the seuen gifts of the holy ghost, very many others into fourteen: but onely into twelue, according to the number of the Apostles, who dictated each of them his article. Lastly, not σύμβολον but συμβολη signifieth a shote, as the learned know, neither can it bee shewed to bee otherwise in any *Greeke* writer.

Ruff. Symb. Aug. ser. de tem. 129.

Quinquag. c. 40.

Indeed

Indeed in Latine writers yee ſhall ſometimes find Symbolum ſo vſed: yet that it is found ſo in any ſkilfull Criticks impute it to the ignorance of Notaries, and by the warrant of the beſt Manuſcripts reſtore the *Feminine Symbola* into the roome thereof.

Others fetch it from *Symbolum* ſignifying a *Pledge* or *token*. and firſt ſuch a pledge whereby perſons eſpouſed bind themſelues to bee faithfull and true one vnto another: becauſe likewiſe in our ſpirituall eſpouſals with Chriſt, as he giues vnto vs his bleſſed ſpirit as an earneſt of his conſtant loue to vs, ſo wee returne backe againe the profeſſion of our faith as a firme pledge of our loyalty and ſubiection to him. This reaſon caries good likelyhood and proportion with it. So doth alſo the next, when it ſignifieth *teſſeram hoſpitalem*, ſuch a token as Cities were wont to giue vnto their friends, that ſhewing it they might find friendly entertainment in confederate townes: or ſuch as one friend was wont to giue vnto an other to the like end. Which how it fits the amitie and frienſhip betweene Chriſt & vs, who ſees not?

Neuertheleſſe I rather thinke it is ſo called from συμβολον as it ſignifieth a *watchword*. For the *Primitiue Church* ſeemeth much to haue beene delighted with militare terms: I ſuppoſe becauſe in Scripture Chriſtians are ſo often compared vnto ſouldiers. And hence it is that the Church is diſtinguiſhed into *Militant and Triumphant*, that Heathen are called Pagans in oppoſition vnto ſouldiers, that the two myſteries of the Church are termed Sacraments, a word importing that oath of obedience which ſouldiers take vnto their Generals. In like manner may the Creed be called a Symbole, becauſe it is as a watchword by which true *Orthodoxe Chriſtians*

many diſcerne one from the other. *Painims, Iewes, Turks, and Hereticks.* Heerwith agreeth *Maximus Taurinenſis,*
Hom. de trad. Symb. *Symbolum teſſera eſt & ſignaculum quo inter fideles perfidoſque ſecernitur: the Symbole* is a watchword or marke by which Faithfull and Faithles men are diſcerned. And
De voland. Virg. l. 3. *Ambroſe, Symbolum cordis ſignaculum eſt, & noſtræ militiæ ſacramentum*: the *Symbole* is the ſeale of the heart, and the ſacrament of our warfare. And
In Symb. *Ruffin, Nequa doli ſurreptio fiat, ſymbola diſcreta unuſquiſque duxſuis militibus tradit, quæ Latine vel ſigna vel indicia nominantur, ut ſi forte occurrerit quis de quo dubitetur, interrogatus ſymbolum prodat ſi ſit hoſtis an ſocius:* leſt there ſhould be any ſurreption or deceit, euery captaine deliuereth vnto his Souldiers a diſtinct watchword, that if they meet with any of whom they doubt, by demanding the watchward they may diſcouer whether hee bee a friend or an enimy. And this hee accommodateth vnto the preſent purpoſe. Now ſeing the Gentiles were wont to giue for their watchword the names of ſome of their
Xenoph pæd. l. 3. & 7. Pauſan. l. 10. Suet. Calig. c. 18. Gods, as Ζεὺς σωτὴρ, Ζεὺς σύμμαχος & ἡγεμών, *Minerua, Iupiter,* and the like: what fitter Symbole could Chriſtians haue, then their Faith in the holy & indiuiduall Trinity? And thus much of the title of the Creed: proceed wee yet further.

Beſides this Creed there are diuers others verie ancient, both Generall of the whole Church, ſuch as are
1. thoſe foure famous ones of Nice, of Epheſus, of *Conſtantinople,* of *Chalcedon*: and Particular, either of ſeuerall Churches, or of priuate men, among which that
2. & of *Athanaſius* is moſt renowned. All which though in formie of words they vary, yet for ſubſtance are all one,
Eph. 4. 5. there being, as S. *Paul* ſaith, but *vna fides, one faith.* Neither

ther yet was this number of Creeds needles or endles. For when hereſies began to encreaſe and preuaile, the Church thought it neceſſary to ſet forth ſome ſhort Confeſſions, by which the people as by a touchſtone might diſcerne the gold of *Orthodoxe* truth from the copper of errors and hereſies. Saith S. *Hilarie*, *Nihil mirum videri debet, fratres chariſſimi, quod tam frequenter exponi fides cæptæ ſint: neceſſitatem hanc furor hæreticus imponit*: you ought not to maruell much, beloued brethren, that nowadayes Creeds are ſo frequently ſet forth: the fury of hereticks hath layd this neceſſity vpon vs. Thus againſt *Arius* denying the diuinity of Chriſt was the Nicene Creed framed: againſt *Macedonius* and *Eudoxius* denying the Deity of the holy Ghoſt, and his proceeding from the Father and the Sonne; the Conſtantinopolitane; againſt *Neſtorius* denying the vnion of both natures of Chriſt in one perſon, the Epheſine: againſt Eutyches confounding both natures, and ſwallowing vp the humane, in the diuine, that of Chalcedon. Thus of late the reformed Churches to quit themſelues of the vniuſt imputations of hereſie and apoſtaſie wherewith they were charged, haue beene forced ſundrie times to ſet forth ſeuerall Confeſſions of their Faith, all which, or moſt of which are recorded in the harmonie of Confeſſions. Scurrilous therefore is that taunt of Papiſts, who for this cauſe terme vs Confeſſioniſts. For what haue we done herein, whereunto their ſlanderous criminations haue not compelled vs? what, whereof we haue, not example from the *Primitiue Church*? Nay, what whereof we haue not Gods expreſſe commandement, charging vs to *bee ready on euery occaſion to render an account of the Hope that is in vs*? 1 Pet. 3. 15.

But yet among all the ancient Creeds, this of the A-
4. postles, hath euer beene counted of greateſt authority,
and ought ſtill ſo to bee counted. Among the ancient
Creeds I ſay: for the Scripture is peerles, and equall au-
thority with it neither may it chalenge vnto it ſelfe, nei-
ther did any of the ancient Fathers giue it, as aboue wee
haue touched. For although the ſubſtance and matter of
the Creed be diuine and perfectly according with the
Scripture, yet for forme and order of words it is hu-
1. mane: whereas the Scripture both for ſubſtance and
circumſtance, matter and forme and all is no way hu-
2. mane, but wholly and entirely diuine. The greater the
In Ro. 12. 6. blaſphemie of *Rhemiſh Ieſuites* auouching this Creed to
be the Rule whereby all the writings of the new Teſta-
ment are to be tried, and approued: whereas contrarily
3. the Scripture out of which the Creed is collected, is the
4. only Rule by which both it and all other Creeds are to
5. bee examined. Howbeit the ſecond place, as it is its
1. due, ſo we willingly yeeld vnto it. Firſt in regard of the
antiquity thereof, becauſe of all other it is the eldeſt.
2. Secondly, for the perfection and fulnes thereof, there
being no one article of abſolute neceſſity vnto *Saluation*,
which is not either in expreſſe tearmes or impliedly and
3. in its principles contayned therein. Thirdly and laſtly,
becauſe it hath had the vniuerſall approbation of all
Churches, in all times, both ancient and moderne. The
ancient Fathers giue vnto it moſt honorable and magni-
ficent titles. They call it, *the key of Faith, the rule of
Faith, the foundation of Faith, the ſumme of Faith, the
forme of Faith, the body of Faith, the rule of truth, the ſa-
crament of humane ſaluation, the myſterie of religion, the
character of the Church*, and the like. On it they commen-

ted

ted rather then on any other Creed: vnto it all others were conformed, ſo as they ſeeme to be but expoſitions of it. Finally, it was their manner neuer to admit any that was *adultus* either to the Sacrament of *Baptiſme*, or to the holy *Euchariſt* without making confeſſion of his Faith by rehearſing this Creed. In like manner, all the reformed *Churches* with all reuerence and duty receiue it: they vſe it in their publick *Liturgies*, and expound it in their *Catechiſmes*. The more malitious is the ſlander of # *Gregorie Martin* and others, who ſhame not to ſay that *we hold not the Chriſtian Faith of the articles of the Creed.* Diſc. of Eng. tranſ. c. 12. Yea, ſaith another of vs, *they haue no faith nor religion, they are infidels, they beleeue not the holy Catholick Church, the communion of Saints, the remiſſion of ſins, that Chriſt is the ſonne of God, or that he deſcended into Hell.* Tho. Wright. Act. And as if theſe had not yet ſaid enough, another opening his mouth as wide as Hel affirmeth our Creed to bee this, *I beleeue in the Diuell the tormentor helmighty corrupter of heauen & earth. And in not-Ieſus-not-Chriſt the only ſtepſonne degenerate, who was ſpoiled of his glory by the holy Ghoſt, and borne of Mary no Virgin &c.* Credo Caluiniſcq. # To all which I anſwer *Increpet te Dominus*, the *Lord rebuke thee Satan. If they haue called our maſter Belzebub*, it can be no diſgrace to vs to ſuffer the ſame reproch. The more incredible things they charge vs withall, the leſſe are themſelues beleeued, and the more credit do wee gaine vnto our profeſſion. All what is contayned in holy writ, & in this Creed of the Apoſtles, in that of *Nice* and *Athanaſius* wee firmely and entirely beleeue. Let Hell and *Antichriſt* and all the brood of Papiſts burſt with malice and enuy: yet this and no other Faith do wee hold and teach. *Finis.* &

A SHORT CATECHISME.

QVæſt. *Who placed you here in this World?*

Anſ. God the maker and Gouernour of all things.

Q. *Wherefore did hee place you here?*

A. To ſerue and glorify him.

Q. *How will he be ſerued?*

A. By doing his holy Will and Commandements.

Q. *What Commandements hath hee giuen you?*

A. The ten Commandements of the Morall law.

Q. *Repeat them vnto me.*

A. Heare Iſrael, I am the Lord thy God, which &c.

Q. *What duties doth God require of you in this law?*

A. Two: to loue God aboue all, and my neighbour as myſelfe.

Q. *Haue you done this perfectly?*

A. No, neither yet can I, nor any man els.

Q. *Why can you not?*

A. Becauſe all are conceiued and borne in ſinne.

Q. *How commeth that to paſſe?*

A. By the fall of our firſt parents.

Q. *Had you obeyed the law what had beene the reward?*

A. Life euerlaſting.

Q. *What*

Q. *What is the puniſhment of Diſobedience?*
A. Eucrlaſting death.
Q. *Your caſe then it ſeemes is very miſerable.*
A. Very miſerable vnleſſe God bee mercifull in Ieſus Chriſt.
Q. *What is Ieſus Chriſt?*
A. The Eternall Sonne of GOD made Man.
Q. *Wherefore was he made Man?*
A. To die for mans ſin and to reconcile him vnto GOD.
Q. *Are all men reconciled by him?*
A. No, but true belieuers onely.
Q. *Who are true Belieuers?*
A. They who by faith accept him for their only Mediatour and Sauiour.
Q. *How is this Faith wrought?*
A. By the preaching of the Goſpell.
Q. *What is the ſumme of the Goſpell?*
A. It is contained in the Apoſtles Creed.
Q. *Repeat the ſame vnto me.*
A. I Belieue in God the Father Almighty, maker &c.
Q. *How may we know that we haue true Faith?*
A. By the fruites thereof.
Q. *What are the fruites of Faith?*
A. New Obedience and Repentance.
Q. *What is new Obedience?*
A. A ſincere practice of holyneſſe and righteouſneſſe all the dayes of my life.
Q. *Can you doe this perfectly?*
A. No: but if I ſtriue vnto perfection God in grace accepteth it.
Q. *But what if you fall into ſinne againe?*
A. I am to riſe againe by ſpeedy repentance:

Q. *What*

Q. *What call you repentance?*

A. A hearty ſorrow for ſinne with the amendement thereof.

Q. *You ſay it muſt bee ſpeedy: tell mee wherefore?*

A. Becauſe if I bee preuented by death I periſh eternally.

Q. *What is the benefit of Repentance?*

A. Forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, with recouery of Gods fauour.

Q. *You haue told mee how Faith is wrought, and how it may bee diſcerned: tell me now how it muſt be nouriſhed and preſerued.*

A. By the vſe of the Sacraments and Prayer.

Q. *What is a Sacrament?*

A. A ſeale of the Couenant of grace.

Q. *What things are required in a Sacrament?*

A. Two things, a ſigne and a thing ſignified.

Q. *How many Sacraments are there?*

A. Two, Baptiſme and the Lords Supper.

Q. *What is Baptiſme?*

A. The Sacrament whereby wee are admitted into the Church of Chriſt.

Q. *What is the outward Signe of Baptiſme?*

A. The ſprinkling of Water vpon the Body.

Q. *What is the thing ſignified?*

A. The waſhing away of ſinne by the Blood of Chriſt.

Q. *What is the Lords Supper?*

A The Sacrament of our ſpirituall nouriſhment and preſeruation vnto eternall life.

Q. *What is the outward ſigne in the Lords Supper?*

A. Bread and Wine.

Q. *What is the thing ſignified?*

A. The

A. The Body of Chriſt broken, and his Blood ſhed for our Redemption.

Q. What is Prayer?

A. An humble intreating of God for all the good things wee ſtand in need of.

Q. After what manner muſt we pray?

A. As we are taught in the Lords prayer.

Q. Repeate the ſame vnto me?

A. Our Father which art in Heauen, hallowed &c.

Q. What is the effect of Prayer?

A. The obtayning of our requeſts.

Q. Doth euery one obtaine that prayeth?

A. No, but hee onely that asketh in faith, and in the Name of Chriſt.

Q. What remaineth to bee done when we haue obtained our ſuites?

A. Wee are to returne vnto God the ſacrifice of praiſe and thankeſgiuing.

Inſtructions for preparation vnto the holy COMMVNION.

Q. I ſee you are deſirous with the reſt of Gods people to bee admitted to the holy Communion: tell me for what cauſe are you ſo deſirous thereof?

A. I am deſirous thereof for two cauſes. Firſt, that I may diſcharge my duty to God, who commandeth mee to receiue ſo often as conueniently I may: ſecondly that I may reap the benefit & comfort which God hath promiſed vnto mee thereby.

Q. *What benefit or comfort hath God promiſed vnto you thereby?*

A. That as by Baptiſme my firſt incorporation into the myſticall Body of Chriſt is already ſealed vp vnto me: ſo by this holy Sacrament my continuall nouriſhment and preſeruation in the ſame Body ſhall likewiſe be ſealed vp vnto me.

Q. *But doe all reape this benefit that receiue this Sacrament?*

A. No, but the worthy receiuer only: for they that receiue vnworthily, eat and drinke to themſelues their owne damnation.

Q. *What things are neceſſarily required vnto worthy Receiuing?*

A. Two things: ſufficient knowledge in the vnderſtanding, and ſanctifying grace in the heart.

Q. *What knowledge count you ſufficient?*

A. A knowledge of the law ſentencing vnto death for ſinne: ſecondly, a knowledge of the Goſpell promiſing euerlaſting life vpon condition of Faith and true repentance: thirdly a knowledge of the Sacraments, and principally of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

Q. *What knowledge is required touching the Lords Supper?*

A. That the ſenſible ſignes vſed therein haue ſpirituall ſignifications: and therefore as the Miniſter hauing bleſſed the bread and wine, breaketh the one and poureth out the other, and I receiuing them into my hands conuey them into my Body for the nouriſhment thereof: ſo God the Father hauing predeſtinated his Son to be our Mediator and Redeemer hath giuen his Body

dy to bee broken and his Blood to be ſhed for vs, that wee receiuing the ſame by Faith may thereby be nouriſhed both bodies and ſoules vnto euerlaſting life.

Q. *But what ſanctifying graces are required in the heart?*

A. Firſt true and vnfained repentance for ſinne: ſecondly a liuely Faith vpon the merits of Chriſt for remiſſion of ſinne: thirdly ſincere loue and charity with our brethren: fourthly, renewed Faith and repentance for our new ſins, and renewed loue in regard of our new breaches with our brethren.

Q. *Well then I ſee you know with what knowledge and grace you ought to bee furniſhed before you can worthily receiue: tell me now how muſt you behaue your ſelfe during the time of adminiſtring this Sacrament?*

A. With feare and reuerence as in the preſence of God who ſeeth the very ſecret of my heart: and therefore baniſhing out of my mind all earthly and impertinent thoughts, I am onely and wholly to attend this heauenly action.

Q. *And when you haue receiued, what duty remaineth to be performed?*

A. Firſt, I am humbly to thanke Almighty God who hath vouchſafed to receiue mee as a gueſt at his holy Table: ſecondly, I am to pray vnto God that pardoning my want of due preparation and all other my infirmities hee would bleſſe this holy Sacrament to the nouriſhment of my ſoule: thirdly, I am carefully to vſe all other meanes ordained by God whereby I may ſtill grow forward in grace till I come to be a perfect man in Chriſt.

If yee know theſe things, bleſſed are yee if yee doe them. Io:

Peccatum formaliter & propriè non esse infinitum, exercitatio aduersus N.

Probatur.

1 *FInitæ Essentiæ finita est Potentia: finitæ Potentiæ finita est Operatio. At Peccatum Operatio est finitæ Essentiæ, Creaturæ nimirum rationalis, Ergo, & finitæ Potentiæ. Quarè & ipsum finitum est.*

2. *Gratia Dei non est potentior Infinito: Infinito enim nihil infinitius. Sed potentior est Peccato: tollit enim ipsum & abolet. Ergo Peccatum non est infinitum.*

3. *Vnum infinitum non est alio maius: quod enim minus est ideò quia minus est non est Infinitum. At Peccatum vnum alio maius est & grauius: Imparitatem enim Peccatorum negare Stoicismus est. Ergò omne Peccatum non est Infinitum.*

4. *Omnes ad vnum Orthodoxi Theologi tenent, Nullum esse Summum malum: Sequeretur enim alioqui duo esse prima rerum Principia, Bonum & Malum, quæ Manichæorum hæresis est. Ergò omne Peccatum non est Infinitum.*

5. *Peccatum consideratur aut vt obliquitas, aut cum Actione. At neutro modo infinitum est. Non vt Actio: præcisa namque à finito vt dictum est, finita sit necesse est. Non vt Obliquitas, sic enim nihil est: Non Entis autem non est accidens, nec igitur accidit ei esse Infinito. Adde quòd*

non

non omnia aquè, ſed unum alio a Scopo propiùs aberret: quare nec omnia infinito internallo.

Obiicitur.

1. *Theologos omnes aſſerere Peccatum eſſe Infinitum: vtrumque enim & Legiſlatorem Deum & Legem Dei, quæ utraque Infinita ſunt, Peccato violari. Reſpondeo.*

1. *Eos qui ſic loquuntur affirmare, Peccatum Obiectiuè, id eſt Materialiter infinitum eſſe, non formaliter.*

2. *Quamuis peccatum infinitam lædat Maieſtatem, non tamen infinito modo: alioqui quouis peccato Deus aquè offenderetur, quod abſurdum eſt.*

3. *Non vt Deus ſic lex Dei infinita: Si eſſet, utique & Deus eſſet, qui ſolus eſt infinitus. Filius quidem Dei verbum increatum eſt: at Lex creatum: non ergò vt illud infinitum. Replicatur. Lex infinita eſt,*

1. *Quia à Deo infinito condita eſt.*

2. *Quia perfecta eſt. Pſal. 19. Reſpondeo.*

1. *Primum illud non ſequi: Non enim quod ab Infinito eſt, id continuò eſt Infinitum. A finito nil niſi finitum procedit: ab infinito vtrumq; & finitum & infinitum. Alioqui mundus hic, immò puluiſculus quilibet aut atomus, cum à Deo ſit, infinitus eſſet.*

2. *Neque Secundum ſi vox illa Perfecta vniuocè intelligatur. Diſtinguo ergò, Perfectum vel abſolutè dici, vel in ſuo genere. Abſolutè, cui nihil deeſt quod in aliquo genere perfectum eſt: & ſic ſolus Deus Perfectus eſt, in quo vno omnes omnium perfectiones eminentiſſimo modo aggregantur, propterea quæ etiam ſolus ſimpliciter & propriè Infinitus eſt. In ſuo genere, cui nihil deeſt quod ad ſuum genus pertinet: & ſic quidem Lex Perfecta eſt, nec quicquam in eâ deſideratur quod ad Legis naturam*

& ingenium ſpectat. At interim quod ſic Perfectum eſt non ſimpliciter & propriè infinitum eſt.

2. Pœna Peccati eſt Infinita: Ergò & Peccatum ipſum. Niſi enim Pœna Peccato analoga ſit, Deus iniuſtus eſt, quod horrendum dictu. Reſpondeo.

1. Si Pœna Peccati ſit infinita, perperàm docent Theologi Deum, vt vltrà Condignum remuneratur, ita punire citrà condignum.

2. Pœna non eſt infinita, tum quia Creatura, diuinaq; iræ extrinſecum effectum: tum quia non omnes pares, ideoque nec omnes infinitæ. Replicatur. Aeterna eſt, Ergò & Infinita. Reſpondeo.

1. Non diſputari de infinitate Durationis ſed grauitatis: quare nihil hoc ad Andromachum.

2. Nego propriè æternam eſſe, ſed æuiternam: incepiſſe enim quamuis deſitura non ſit, ideoque nec propriè infinitam.

3. Peccatum in Electis ne pœnas quidem æuiternas luere: quare ſaltem in illis peccata non eſſe infinita. In reprobis iuſtum eſt ut nunquam careant ſupplicio, quia nunquam voluerunt carere peccato.

3 Paſſio Chriſti vtroque modo infinita eſt & mole & duratione: Ergò & peccatum cuius pœnas Chriſtus pro nobis luit. Reſpondeo.

1. Non ſequi: maiorus enim illa meriti propter dignitatem perſonæ, quàm mille peccatorum myriades demeriti.

2. Paſſio Chriſti mole finita fuit: creatura enim, creatura etiam natura quâ patiebatur.

3. Nego duratione æuiternam, nedum æternam fuiſſe. Quî pote? Niſi fortè triginta quatuor plùs minùs anni, in quibus ſolis [illegible] fuit, pro totâ æternitate cenſeri poſſint. Replicatur. At propter dignitatem Perſonæ æternæ,

Pœna

Pœna fuit etiam æterna. Respondetur.

1. *Verba perplexa, & nequid gravius dicam sophistica quorum si hæc mens & sententia sit, Passionem Christi temporalem propter dignitatem personæ æternæ, passioni nostræ æternæ etiam ad assem æquivalere, tria dico.*
1. *Aliter dictum oportuisse: nec enim hunc sensum verba præferre.*
2. *Hinc sequi Pœnam Christi temporalem duntaxat, non æternam fuisse.*
3. *Ideo Christum pœnas æternas non passum, quia peccata Electorum pro quibus passus est non futura erant æterna: quippe, per gratiam divinam interpellanda & interrumpenda.*
2. *Siquid aliud hæc verba sibi volunt, quæratur Sibylla aut somniorum coniector aliquis: Mihi divinari nec libet nec vacat.*
4. *At quid frequentius in sacris concionibus scriptisque Theologicis, quàm Peccatum infinitum, Pœnam infinitam &c. Respondeo.*
1. *Non omnia ab omnibus propriè dici, præsertim in demegorijs & homilijs ad populum: sed pleraque tropicè & καθ' ὑπερβολὴν, ad rei magnitudinem indicandam.*
2. *Intelligendi sunt de Peccato non formaliter, sed materialiter & obiectivè loqui, vt suprà dictum est: quia Peccato Maiestas infinita violatur.*
3. *Distinguo, Rem omnem considerari vel vt quiddam Ens, vel secundum propriam suam rationem. Vt Ens, finita est res omnis creata. Secundum rationem suam propriam infinita dici potest, si quicquid ad se pertinere ullo modo potest non limitata, nec secundùm mensuram habeat. Sic lucem Solis infinitam dicimus, non quidem secundùm suum Esse, sed secundùm rationem lucis:*

lucis: quia habet quicquid ad communem rationem lucis pertinere potest. Pari ratione, Peccatum, Pœna, Passio, priori modo proculdubiò finita sunt: infinita secundo, si ullo modo infinita sunt, hoc est, secundùm quid, non propriè & simpliciter, quod in thesi affirmatur. Quod etiam non de omni Peccato aut Pœnâ intelligendum est, sed fortasse de Peccato in Spiritum Sanctum, aut saltem illo Diaboli: deque pœnâ Gehennæ intensissimâ.

OF CHOICE OF MEATS AND ABSTINENCE.

I Will endeauour to ſatisfy your demaund the beſt I can, and to reſolue you in the queſtion *of choice of Meats and Abſtinence:* but briefly and in few words. It may pleaſe you therefore to remember.

1. That all *Meats* in regard of their nature and creation are good. For of euery thing that was created God himſelfe ſingularly and ſeuerally auoucheth that it *was good*, and of all iointly and collectiuely that they were *exceeding good*. In particular of *Meats*, S. *Paul affirmeth that they are good, and created to bee receiued with thankeſgiuing.* Gen.1.4.10. 12,18,21,25. 31. 2.Tim.4.3.4.

2. They that ſay the contrary are charged by Saint *Paul* to hold *a doctrine of Diuels.* And iuſtly were the *Manichæans, Tatiani and Encratitæ*, for maintaining that ſome *Meats* are of a polluted and vncleane nature, euer accounted and condemned as Heretiks in the Church of God. 2.Tim.4.1.

3. God who is the Creator of *Meats*, and ſouereigne Lord of all things, hath full and abſolute power ouer the

Meats, and may restraine the vse of any kind of them at his pleasure. Which when it appeareth he hath done, the Conscience is bound to absolute obedience and abstinence from meats so forbidden.

Leuit. 11. 4 While therefore the Ceremoniall part of the law remained in force, wherein sundry kinds of Meats were interdicted vnto the Iewes, partly to distinguish them thereby from other nations, partly to figure out the Churches election and separation from the rest of the world: it had beene a breach of Religion and a great sin to put no difference between meat and meat, but to haue vsed them all indifferently.

5 By the comming of Christ the shadowes of the law are vanished, and the distinction of meats is vtterly abolished and taken away: as appeareth by the vision of the *Sheet* shewed vnto *Peter*, and the voice that said vnto him. *The things that God hath purified pollute thou not.* And the free vse or non-vse of them is a part of that Christian liberty which Christ by his blood hath purchased vnto vs, who *vnto the cleane*, (as the Apostle saith,) *hath made all things cleane.*

Act. 10. v. 15.

Rom. 14. 14. 20.

Tit. 1. 15.

6 In this Liberty so dearely bought we are commanded to stand fast, and not to suffer our selues againe *to be entangled with the yoke of bondage.* We *entangle* our selues if now we place any holynes or religion in abstinence from some kind of meats, or if we abstaine to the end wee may satisfy for our sins, or thereby merit vnto our selues euerlasting life. For Meat, as S. *Paul* saith, *maketh vs not acceptable vnto God:* and againe, *The Kingdome of God is not meate or drinke but righteousnes and peace and ioy in the holy Ghost.* And yet againe, *It is a good thing that the hart bee stablished with grace and not*

Gal. 5. 1.

1. Cor. 8. 8.

Rom. 14. 17.

Heb. 13. 9.

with

with meats which haue not profited them that haue beene occupied therein.

7. The Church of *Rome* therefore commanding abstinence from some kinds of meats to the same ends, and as a part of diuine worship, is guilty of horrible sacriledge and cruell tyranny. For she robbeth the Church of her Liberty: and imposeth vpon her that heauy yoke, which Christ himselfe had taken off her necke. To what end hath Christ freed our consciences, if *Rome* may againe enthrall them? and how easie a matter is it to auoid punishment and to win heauen if abstinence from flesh and egges will worke it?

8. As wee must *stand fast in this libertie*, so must we take heed that we abuse not our *Liberty*, making it, as S. *Peter* speaketh *a cloake for our naughtines*, or, as S. *Paul* saith, *vsing it as an occasion to the flesh*. For though *all things*, that is, all indifferent things, *bee lawfull*, yet are they not alwayes *expedient*: and therefore are not alwayes indifferently to bee vsed or not vsed, but as they are conuenient, and wee find them tend either to edification or destruction. 1.Pet.2.16. Gal.5.13. 1.Cor.10.23.

9. They are conuenient and destroy not when they are regulated and guided by *Charity*, *Temperance*, *Piety*, *and Loyalty*. First by *Charity*. For wee may not by *eating giue occasion of falling to them that are weake*. So doing, wee should not *walke charitably*, but *destroy with our meats him for whom Christ died*. Though *all things be pure, yet is it euill to eat with offence*. When wee so sin *against the Brethren and wound their weake conscience, we sinne against Christ*. Wherefore S. *Paul* resolued rather then by eating he would offend his brother he *would not eat flesh while the world standeth*. 1.Cor.8.9. Rom.14.15. V.20.21. 1.Cor.8.13. 14.

10. Secondly, by *Temperance* and *Sobriety*. For repletion and fulneſſe nouriſh in vs our inordinate luſts, and make vs like pampered horſes grow head-ſtrong and vnruly. Wee may not therefore abuſe our liberty vnto ſurfetting and drunkenneſſe: yea if wee find that ſome meats or drinks, though not exceſſiuely taken, doe inflame our luſts, wee muſt abſtaine. And this was the cauſe, as I ſuppoſe, why the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* knits theſe two together, *in Faſting, in Chaſtity*. For according to the old ſaying, *Sine Cerere & Baccho friget Venus*, without bread and wine venery and luſt waxeth cold.

Rom. 13. 13.

2. Cor. 6. 6.

11. And here I cannot but wonder at the vanity and peruerſneſſe of *Romaniſts*, who for the ſubduing and taming of the fleſh, at times forbid the eating of fleſh, but in the meane ſeaſon giue leaue to feed on all ſorts of fiſhes, marmelades, and conſerues, and to drinke the ſtrongeſt and choiceſt wines, which without queſtion prouoke and ſtirre vp luſt as well as fleſh. As if to eat a bit of courſe fleſh vpon a prohibited day were gluttony: but to cram our ſelues with all other delicates were abſtinence and faſting. O blindneſſe! O ſtupidity!

12. Thirdly by *Piety* and *Religion*. For although *Abſtinence* as *Hierome* ſaith, bee not in it ſelfe a vertue, nor any part of Diuine worſhip, yet is it an inſtrument, help, and furtherance thereunto. And therefore if wee would humble our ſelues by repentance, or pray vnto God with feruency for the auerting of dangers imminent, or calamities incumbent vpon vs: we are then by faſting to teſtify our humiliation, and to quicken our deuotion, as wee read the faithfull both vnder the Law and Goſpell were euer wont to doe.

13. Laſtly

13. Laſtly by *Loialtie and Dutifull ſubiection.* For if the Magiſtrate, either for a publick ciuill good ſhall at times forbid the vſe of ſome meats, as of fleſh on fridayes, ſaturdayes, emberweeks, lent, and the like, or for the pacifying of Gods wrath in the common calamity of the ſtate, ſhall command a generall Faſt: wee are accordingly to abſtaine, and to yeeld obedience vnto the *Magiſtrate, not only for feare, but alſo for Conſcience ſake.* Rom. 13. 6.

14. Thus then firſt you haue Libertie by Chriſt to eate of all kind of meats: ſecondly, you are bound to ſtand faſt in your Liberty and not to put your ſelfe vnder bondage againe: thirdly, you may not wantonlie abuſe you liberty by doing ſuch things as are inconuenient, and hurt rather then edifie: laſtly, our vſe thereof muſt be moderated and directed by *Charity, Temperance, Piety* and *Loyalty.* This if you know, and thus if you doe, you cannot erre nor doe amiſſe. 1. 2. 3. 4.

15. Which that you may both know and doe you are to pray him that is the donor and giuer of all good things, to make you both wiſe and prudent. Wiſe in the knowledge and practice of whatſoeuer is of abſolute neceſſity vnto ſaluation: prudent in the diſcretion and right vſe of things indifferent. This God grant you for his *Chriſts* ſake. *Amen.* 1. 2.

AN ANSWER VNTO CERTAINE REASONS FOR SEPARATION.

I Could haue wished withall my hart that in this particular I might haue proued a falſe prophet: and that my feares concerning you, though they were not without cauſe, yet might haue been without effect. But now I plainly perceiue that my words were no leſſe then oracle, and what I feared is accordingly come to paſſe. For, as I foretold you, from ſtraining at ghats, you are fallen to ſwallowing of Camels: that is, from ſcrupulouſnes and niceues in Kneeling at the *Communion*, and other ſuch like indifferent ceremonies, you haue headlong caſt your ſelfe into the gulfe of Schiſme and Separation. In regard whereof, hauing heretofore in the matter of Kneeling beſtowed my labour in vaine vpon you, I feare, now that you are thus farre proceeded, and ſetled as it were on your lees, I ſhall much leſſe preuayle with you. Neuertheles, becauſe it pleaſed you to ſend me in writing the reaſons of your Separation, promiſing to returne with all ſpeed if they were ſufficiently anſwered:

red: I may not, vnlesse I will betray the truth, and faile in the duties of Charity, refuse to take a little further paines with you. Here therefore I send you this short, and, (as I conceiue), full answer: the perusall whereof I leaue vnto you, the censure vnto Gods Church, and the issue vnto God himselfe. Whom I humbly beseech of his goodnesse eftsoones to reduce you.

Two grounds you say there are whereon you haue built your Separation: the first whereof you lay downe in these tearmes, *That the Hierarchie and Ministrie of Arch-bishops, Lord Bishops, &c. and Priests may not bee set ouer the Church of Christ, nor retained therein.* From whence, as I vnderstand it, you would argue and conclude thus.

Where are such Church Officers as may not bee set ouer, nor retained in the Church, there is no true visible Church, and consequently Separation must bee made from it.
But here in England are such Church Officers, as Arch-bishops, Bishops &c. and Priests.
Ergo, here in England is no true visible Church, and consequently Separation must bee made from it.

To this argument thus formed I answer, first by denying the Maior Proposition: which in that you goe not about to proue, you commit that fault in reasoning which Logicians call *Petitionem Principij*, taking that for granted which is most questioned. For suppose that Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests were superfluous officers, yet it is not euery superfluity in a Church that takes away the nature and essence thereof: and euen they who mislike the present Church gouernement, doe not

all

all of them, as you Separatists doe, inferre thereupon a nullity, but onely a corruption or aberration in the Church. It would haue beene much more to the purpose, if you could haue demonstrated that the Church of *England* is defectiue in such officers as are essentiall, and without which a Church cannot be. Here therefore I must entreat you either to acknowledge your rashnesse, or else to bestow a little more paines in the proofe of that which without euidence of reason will neuer be yeelded you.

Againe I deny the Minor Proposition, affirming contrarily that Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests are lawfull Church-Officers, and may bee both set ouer and retained in the Church. For I hope you vnderstand these tearmes not cauillingly and equiuocally, but according to the meaning and definition of the Church of *England*. Otherwise you shall but iangle about words, and bewray that you haue more desire to picke quarels, then ability to iustify your Separation. But you endeauour to fortify your Minor by twelue reasons supplying in the tale if ought bee wanting in the weight. Let vs examine them seuerally. The first is this.

No

1 *No Antichristian ministrie may bee set ouer the Church of Christ, nor retained therein.* 2. Thes. 2. 3. 4. 11. 12. Ro. 14. 9 10. with Ex. 4. 4. Deut. 7. 26. Ps. 119. 21. 118.

But the Ministrie of Arch-bishops, Lord-Bishops & Priests is Antichristian, because the Churches of Antichrist cannot bee compleate, if they haue not this Prelacy, as appeareth by the Popes Canons and Pontificall, and by their Church-Constitution.

Therefore they are not to bee set ouer the Church of Christ, nor retained therein.

What meane you by the word *Antichristian?* For although I know well what properly it signifies, yet I doubt much what you vnderstand thereby: it being your manner either through negligence or ignorance too often to speake improperly. If you vnderstand it properly, and as you ought, for that which is against Christ and his ordinance, or, as your men sometimes expresse themselues, which is a speciall part of Antichrists apostasie, then I yeeld you your Maior, and confesse that no such Ministrie may bee set ouer the Church nor retained therein. But if you meane thereby either that which was first instituted and deuized by Antichrist, or that which being formerly instituted is vsed and approued in the Church of Antichrist, then I deny the Maior. For first, euery thing (by Antichrist ordained) is not presently vnlawfull and Antichristian, no more then euery act of a tyrant is vniust and tyrannous. How many good and wholesome lawes were enacted vnder the raigne of *Richard* the third, who yet was a most bloody and cruell tyrant? Neither were they afterward repealed by succeeding Kings, but stand still in force notwithstanding

his tyranny: for they proceeded from him *non quà tyrannus*, not as hee was a tyrant, but as hee was a wise and politicke gouernour. In like manner, not euery thing ordained by Antichrist is foorthwith to bee reiected, but onely that which hee doth *quà Antichristus*, as hee is Antichrist, and is meerely Antichristian. It is a great folly to refuse good counsell because it is giuen by an euill man. Wise men will consider *non quis sed quid*, not so much who doth a thing, as what is done. For as truth is Gods in whose mouth soeuer it bee found: so is good also whosoeuer bee the Author thereof. Againe, if those things whereof Antichrist is the first founder bee not therefore by and by vnlawfull, much lesse are those things so, which being of a former institution are onely vsed and obserued by him. Were it otherwise, how many ordinances of God himselfe, and wholesome constitutions of the primitiue Church would proue vnlawfull being still retained in Popery?

This Maior you endeauour to fortify with sundry passages of Scripture. But as *Cassius* of old was wont to say, *Cui bono?* to what end? For if you would proue it in the sense granted you, they are alledged needlesly: if in the sense denied, friuolously; and to speake the truth euery way vainely and impertinently, as the very reading of them will manifest to any one that will but take the paines to peruse them. But this is the manner of your men to paint your margents with multitude of quotations nothing to the purpose: whereas one allegation directly concluding is more then a hundred demonstrations, as being the words of the first and infallible verity. What you intend hereby I wot not, whether to amuse the Reader and ouerwhelme him with your numbers, or

to

to win you credit and estimation with the vulgar, as if you were the onely skilfull Text-men. But sure I am that such sleighting of Scripture is no lesse then the taking of Gods Name in vaine: which whosoeuer doth, the Lord professeth he *will not hold him guiltlesse*. Scripture is not made nor appointed for pompe and shew, but for conquest and victory.

To the Minor Proposition I answer negatiuely, *The ministrie of Arch-bishops, Lord-Bishops, and Priests* is not Antichristian, whether you vnderstand it as first inuented by Antichrist, or against Christ. That it is not of Antichrists inuention is as cleere as the Sunne. For first Priests are of diuine institution, being no other then those Presbyters or Pastors, to whom the administration of the Word and Sacraments is committed, and who are ordained by Christ for the building vp of his Church vnto the end of the world. The Priests of the Church of Rome indeed are of Antichrists founding, whose office is to sacrifice and offer vp Christ himselfe in the Masse vnto his Father both for the quicke and the dead. But our Priests haue nothing common with them saue the name onely: their idolatry wee detest and abhorre, although wee retaine the name. Theirs are Masse-Priests, ours are Preaching or Ministring Priests. Neither let the name offend you: for notwithstanding Papists haue abused it to signifie a Sacrificer, yet properly it doth not so, being originally deriued from Presbyter, neither among vs is it now so vnderstood. To say nothing that the anciẽt Fathers (who I presume were not Antichristian) vsually call the Ministers of the Gospell *Sacerdotes*, Priests. As therefore you cannot without great absurdity reason from the name to the thing, thus, *your Mini-*

sters are called Priests, Ergo, your Ministrie is Antichristian: so neither can you without greater absurdity separate your selfe from the thing because of the name, and because our Ministers are called Priests withdraw your selfe from our Ministrie.

Secondly, Arch-bishops and Bishops if they be not of diuine institution, yet were they some Centuries of yeeres before euer Antichrist appeared in the world, as all antiquity and Ecclesiasticall Story testifieth. That most famous first generall Councell of Nice assembled by *Constantin the Great* about the yeere of our Lord
Nice. 327. 327 not onely approueth them, but also affirmeth that the Church anciently and long before that time had been gouerned by them. *Epiphanius* & *Augustin* both reckon
¶ *Aerius* among the number of Hereticks, for denying the then-receiued and allowed distinction between a Bishop and a Presbyter. But to speake my mind plainely, I am for my part perswaded, that the superiority of Bishops
¶ ouer the Ministers was of Apostolicall institution. Those
* Angels to whom Saint *Iohn* in the second and third of the Reuelation is commanded to write, what other were they then the Bishops of those Churches of *Asia?* In *Ephesus*, one of those seuen Churches, it is reported by S. *Luke* that there were many Presbyters, and I doubt not but it was so in other of the Churches also: howbeit the Apostle writeth vnto one onely whom hee calleth the
¶ Angell, as being singular and eminent aboue the rest. And the ancient story of the Church recordeth the particular Bishops of euery one of those Churches together with their successors for a long time. So that Bishops being in the Apostles time, and successiuely continued in the Primitiue Church, without any contradiction either

of

of the Apoſtles themſelues or any other, yea rather with their approbation and allowance (as appeareth by thoſe ſeuen Epiſtles vnto the ſeuen Angels, and all the writings of the ancient Fathers): how can it bee imagined but that Biſhops and their ſuperiority ouer others was of Apoſtolicall inſtitution?

Now if *Prieſts* or *Paſtors* (for as wee haue ſayd, in ſubſtance they be all one) were ordained by God himſelfe, and *Biſhops* deriue their pedigree alſo from the holy *Apoſtles* of God: it followeth by neceſſary conſequence, that as our *Miniſtery* is not from *Antichriſt*, ſo neither is it againſt Chriſt. Were it againſt Chriſt, it would be either becauſe he hath forbidden it, or for that it deſtroyeth rather then edifieth the *Church*. But it is no where forbidden. If it bee, ſhew the place, and wee yeeld. Neither doth it hinder the edification of the *Church*. For firſt it is the office both of *Biſhops* & *Prieſts* to preach the Goſpell of Chriſt, and to adminiſter his holy *Sacraments*. Secondly, the aduancement of one *Preſbyter* aboue the reſt, was for the preuention of *Schiſme*. For when *Factions began to ariſe in the Church, ſome ſaying I am of Paul, others I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas: then, ſayth Hierom, was it decreed through the whole world, that one being choſen from among the Preſbyters ſhould be ſet ouer the reſt*. Who being ſo preferred, his duty is to ouerſee the reſt of his brethren, that they carefully diſcharge the office impoſed vpon them, and frame their liues according to the worthines of their calling: All which I am ſure furthereth the building of the *Church*, ſo farre is it from deſtroying: ſo that nor Prieſts nor *Biſhops*, whether yee regard their offices, or the end of their ordination, can be ſayd to be againſt Chriſt.

Peraduenture (for I would willingly let nothing passe vnanswered) there lies a mistery in the word *Lord-Bishops*; and you intend that they are the more *Antichristian* for that they are so called. Surely if they should ambitiously affect the title of *Lord*, (as the *Pharisees* sometimes did the title of *Rabbi*) it were great pride and vanity in them: and if they should κατακυριεύειν, Lord it, and as it were domineere ouer the flock of Christ as if the inheritance were theirs, it would be intollerable presumption & tyranny. But, that a title of honour may be giuen vnto Bishops in regard of their honorable place and calling, as there is no reason to the contrary; so it must needs proceed from much enuie or frowardnesse to deny. *Let it not bee displeasing in the eyes of my Lord*, saith *Rahel* to her Father. *Art not thou my Lord Elias?* And againe, *Was it not told my Lord what I did when Iezebel slew the Prophets of the Lord*, said good *Obadiah* vnto the Prophet? If *Laban* because he was a naturall Father vnto *Rahel*, and *Eliah*, because hee was a Prophet might iustly bee so stiled: why may not Bishops also, who are the spirituall Fathers, and Prophets, yea and Angels of the Church? you will say, our Sauiour expresly forbiddeth them to bee called Gratious Lords. I deny it. For although it pleased the translator so to render the originall word Εὐεργέται, because anciently it was a title of honour giuen vnto Princes: yet doth it not properly signify so, but Benefactors, or Wel-doers. Neuertheless suppose it so signified, yet is it not simply the title, but the ambitious affectation of the title which Christ disliketh. If a man imitating Iesus Christ should goe about εὐεργετῶν *doing good*, were it a sinne trow you to giue him his deserued name and to call him εὐεργέτην a wel-doer?

Mat. 23.

Gen. 31. 35. 1 King. 18. 7. 13.

Luc. 22. 25. 26.

Act. 10. 38.

Had

Had it been simply vnlawfull for a Minister to be called Lord, would *Paul* and *Silas* haue admitted it, and not rather haue reprehended the keeper of the prison saying vnto them, *My Lords, what ought I to doe that I may bee saued?* Our Sauiour Christ saith vnto his disciples, *Bee not yee called Masters, Bee not yee called Doctors*: and yet among you some Ministers are called Doctors, and all Masters. So that it appeareth by your owne practice, that the name of Lord maketh not Bishops Antichristian, but as wee haue said, it is the affecting of the name which is forbidden. And thus you see your Minor is no way true. Act. 16. 30. Mat. 23. 8. 10.

Notwithstanding you endeauour to proue it thus, *Because the Churches of Antichrist cannot be compleate without this Prelacy, as appeareth*, you say, *by the Popes Canons, and Pontificall, and by their Church-constitutions.* A seely and sory argument. For first, the Ministrie of the Church of *England* is so farre from being a complement of the Churches of Antichrist, that the Church of *Rome* doth Anathematize and accurse it, esteeming vs (right as you doe) to bee no Church at all because wee want their Ministry. Againe, may not I with as good reason as you argue thus? The state and Kingdome of Antichrist cannot be compleate without the authority of Ciuill Magistrates: *Ergo*, Ciuill Magistrates are Antichristian. If this kinde of reasoning bee not good, neither is yours; for they are both of one mould. Lastly Antichristianity being a Mysterie, and not an Heathnish or Turkish opposition vnto Christ, it cannot be compleate except it retaine many of Christs ordinances, which therefore I trust you will not say to bee Antichristian. A lie cannot subsist but vpon truth, nor euill but in good: nor

nor Antichrists hypocrisie but vpon the Religion and discipline of Christ./ And thus haue I fully answered your first argument: whereon I haue been the longer because it is the *Basis* and ground as it were of all the rest, and the answer thereunto will in a manner serue them all, or the most part of them. Your second argument is this.

* Eph. 4. 11. 12. 1. Cor. 12. 4. 5. 6. 28. 29. Ro. 12. 7. 8. 1. Tim. 3. & 5. 3. 9. 17. & 6. 13. 14. * Ezr. 2. 62. 63. Heb. 3. 2. 3. & 2. 1. 2. 3. & 12. 25.

2. *Because it cannot be approued by the testament of Christ, as the Ministrie had in his Church may and ought to bee.* * *And if such (as could not proue by their genealogie that they were of Aaron) were deposed from their Ministrie vnder Moses Law* *, *much more should such bee now deposed, as haue not their offices warranted by Christs Testament.*

If wee reduce your argument into forme it is this, *That Ministrie which cannot bee approued by the Testament of Christ is not to bee allowed in the Church. But the Ministrie of the Church of England cannot bee approued by the Testament of Christ. Ergo, it is not to bee allowed in the Church.* The Minor which you might be sure we would deny, you haue left naked to the wide world without proofe: the Maior which you saw wee could not well deny, you endeauour to fortifie with a double reason. Let it be supposed then that it is denied how proue you it? First, *The Ministerie had in the Church may and ought to bee so approued.* How doth this appeare? By the places quoted in the margent? Nothing lesse: They approue indeed certaine officers in the Church: but affirme not that euery officer ought to bee so approued. Secondly, if, say you, *such as could not derive their genealogy from Aaron were deposed, much more are they to be depo-*

deposed who cannot warrant their offices by Christs Testament. A poore argument God wot. For in the law there was an expresse commandment that none might execute the Priests office but hee that was of the linage of *Aaron*: but that no office might bee admitted nor retained in the Church vnlesse it were so commanded, I find no where in Scripture. Wherefore to argue thus, *Nothing that is against Gods Word may bee allowed, Ergo, nor any thing that is not commanded*, is a plaine *Non sequitur*, and it followes not. Thus you see, if a man were so disposed, how easie it is to quarell with your Maior, which yet simply I deny not.

Briefly therefore to cleare all, I distinguish of these tearmes, Approued and Warranted by the Word. A thing may bee said to bee warranted or approued by the Word two wayes, both when it is commanded, and when it is not forbidden: for things neither commanded nor forbidden, are indifferent, and subiect vnto the Churches power. Hereupon thus I answer, if you meane it in the former sence only, then proue your Maior that what is not by commandment approued is vnlawfull: if in the latter then I grant you the Maior, that whatsoeuer is forbidden is vnlawfull. But withall I deny the Minor, that Archbishops, Bishops, Priests are forbidden, requiring you to proue it, which I know you can neuer doe. For as touching so much of their dutie as is common to them all, to wit, the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the Sacraments, they are all Pastors and Teachers, and so warranted in the Texts by you quoted: but in regard of preeminence and superiority one aboue another Bishops are no other then were the Angels of the seuen Churches, as wee haue aboue demonstrated.

Howsoeuer, if Bishops bee not commanded, yet are they not forbidden: and their office making not against edification, but for it rather, it cannot being ordained by the Church but be lawfull. Your third argument.

3 *Because the Church is the Spouse, Kingdome and Body of Christ, and therefore may not haue Antichrists Hierarchie and ministrie set ouer it, or retained in it. For what concord hath Christ with Belial?*

Antichrists Hierarchie and Ministrie may not be set ouer the Church nor retained in it. Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, are Antichrists Hierarchie and Ministrie. Ergo, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, may not bee set ouer the Church nor retained in it. The Maior of this Syllogisme you are very carefull to maintaine, because the Church is the Spouse, the Kingdome, the Body of Christ: as also because there can bee no concord betwixt Christ and *Belial*. But to what end all this: and with such a stirre to proue that which no man gainsayes: for wee confesse Christs Kingdome may not be gouerned by Antichrists policie. You should rather haue laboured to strengthen the Minor, that *Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests are Antichrists Hierarchie and Ministrie*: for you might be well assured wee would neuer yeeld you that vnlesse by strength of reason you constrained vs. Here therefore against the rule of Logicke againe you beg the principall matter in question, taking for granted that those offices are meerely Antichristian. But you must proue it, and not looke that whatsoeuer you fancie to be true, others vpon your bare word must presently beleiue and take

take to bee true. See the answer to the first argument. I proceed to the fourth.

4 *If when a King substituteth Iudges, Iustices &c. no subiects may either refuse to bee gouerned by these, or set ouer themselues officers of other Kingdomes, as the Roman tribunes &c. how can it be lawfull for any Christians? &c.*

It is an old saying that *Symbolical diuinitie is no argumẽt of proofe*: and that *Similitudes* serue rather to illustrate and cleare a mans meaning, then to proue and conuince the vnderstanding. In regard whereof if I had so pleased, I might well haue sleighted this fourth reason, and not haue vouchsafed it any answere at all. For what is it other then a bare and naked *Similitude?* neuertheles for further satisfaction let vs trie the strength thereof. Two things you auouch, first that *Christians may not refuse to bee gouerned by those officers which Christ hath set ouer them*: secondly, that *Christians may not set ouer themselues officers of Antichrists kingdome.* The former I confesse is true, but nothing to the purpose. For we reiect not the officers ordained by Christ, nor refuse to be gouerned by them. If we doe, so haue all *Churches* also done, downe from S. *Iohns* time vnto this present age. within which compasse you cannot name any one *Church* at any time moulded after your platforme: and I am sure all orthodoxall *Churches* haue euer beene gouerned by the same officers that ours is. Whence it followeth that if for want of such a *Politie* and such *Officers* as you dreame of we haue in *England* no true *Church*: neither hath there beene for certaine hundred of yeares aboue a thou-

thousand any true *Church* through the whole world. Which how it can agree with the word of God affirming that of his kingdome there shall be none end, I cannot conceiue. For by your reckoning the kingdome of Christ ceased soone after the departure of the *Apostles*, and suffered an interruption of about fourteen hundred yeares vntill *Browne* and *Barrow* began to play the *Schismatickes*.

The second *Proposition* I acknowledge also to be true but withall denie that we haue set ouer our selues any *Antichristian* or forraigne *Officers*. For as we haue aboue both sayd and shewed, *Archbishops*, *Bishops*, *Priests* are of diuine institution: and now I further adde that they were first bred in the kingdome of Christ, and not taken from any other kingdome. your assertion to the contrary without due proofe argues that you build to your selfe castles in the aire, and haue no ground for your presumption. Your fift argument followeth.

5. *Because the Church being Christs spouse, kingdome, and body must haue his Ministrie set and kept in it, and no other. And if no man can make a finger or the least member of a naturall humane body, or adde any other limme thereto without deformity then God hath created, and can much lesse giue life to any such counterfait member of his owne making: how is it possible that he can set vp another Ministrie?*

The argument is thus to bee formed, *The Ministrie of Christ and no other is to be set ouer and kept in the Church. The Ministrie of Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests is not Christs. Ergo, it is not to be set ouer nor kept in the Church.*

1. Cor. 12. 12. 20 27, 28.

The

The Maior I grant confessing that no office may bee allowed in the Church but that which is from Christ, eyther immediately, or mediatly, that is, from those vnto whose wisdome and discretion hee hath delegated some part of his authority to order many things in the Church. For as the Church may not alter that Ministry which Christ hath setled to continue for euer: so may shee by vertue of her delegate authority ordaine such offices as are not forbidden, and tend to edification. And being so ordeined they are though not immediatly, yet mediately from Christ. Neither yet doth the Church so doing presume to make (as you say) either a finger, or any other member or limme that is essentiall vnto the body, much lesse to giue life thereunto: but onely to prouide a glouе as it were for the finger, or a sute of apparell for the body the better to preserue it in life.

The Minor that the *Ministrie of Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests is not of Christ*, I deny, affirming the cleane contrary, that they are those Pastors and Angels authorized and allowed by Christ in his word. It is the greatest vanity and idlenesse that can bee in disputing, onely with boldnesse to affirme that which is denied, and neuer to endeauour the proofe thereof: which yet is your solemne fault almost in euery argument. Your first reason.

6 *Because Christians are the Temples of the Holy Ghost, and their consciences wrought vpon by Ministrie in the Church: and therefore may not be defiled by the Hierarchie of Arch-bishops &c. whom the Holy Ghost neuer made Ouerseers.* 1. Cor. 3. 16. 17. 2. Cor. 6. 16. 1. Thes. 2. 4. Col. 2. 18. Act. 20. 17. 28.

The argument in forme stands thus, *Those offices that*

defile the Temples of the Holy Ghost and consciences of men may not bee set ouer nor retained in the Church. But the Hierarchie of Arch-bishops, Bishops, and Priests defiles the Temples of the Holy Ghost and consciences of men. Ergo, the Hierarchie of Arch-bishops, Bishops, and Priests may not bee set ouer nor retained in the Church. The Maior wee readily yeeld you: but how proue you the Minor, that these Officers defile the Conscience? Forsooth because the Holy Ghost hath not made them Ouerseers. And how proue you this againe? Because the Pastors of *Ephesus* were made such Ouerseers. An *Herculean* argument I promise you. For what letteth but that hee that made the Pastors of *Ephesus* Ouerseers, hath made the Pastors of *England* Ouerseers also? Alas, alas that vpon such friuolous and toying reasons so dangerous and offensiue Schismes should be made. And take heed how you quench or grieue the Spirit of God, who if you haue in you any measure of knowledge or sparke of grace, hath wrought it in you by our Ministrie. For preaching which is the ordinary meanes to beget faith, I suppose you haue not had elsewhere: and it is no lesse then blasphemie to call the working of Gods Spirit by his Holy Word vpon the soules of men, the defiling of the Conscience. The seuenth argument.

7. *Because*

7 *Because Christ alone is the Head of the Church in whom all fulnesse of power dwelleth, and from whom alone the Church receiueth her life and power, so as none may bee subiect to any power or head in Religion, saue onely to him. And therefore no Ministers or Officers in the Church are to bee set vp or retained who deriue not their power and functions from Christ, which the former doe not: and therefore they are not &c. but to bee abandoned as enemies of Christs soueraigne authority, and making their hearers and submitters to them guilty of high treason against our Lord Christ Iesus.*

Eph. 1. 22, 23. 4. 11. 16. Col. 1. 18. 19. 2. 8. 9. 10. 18. 19. 1. Cor. 12. 4. 5. 6. 12. 27. 28. 1. Tim. 3. & 5. 8. 6. 13. 14. Rev. 11. 13. 18. 8. 14. 8. 17. & 18. & 19.

It is true, there is but one Head of the Church from whom shee receiueth life and Power: yet are there also vnder Christ gouernors in the Church, who by vertue of that power which they haue receiued from him may ordaine many things touching the well gouernment thereof, and to submit our selues thereunto is not *to bee subiect to another power or head*, but to the ordinance of Christ himselfe. But it is false that *Bishops deriue not their power and function from Christ*, as we haue already manifestly proued. If you haue any thing to the contrary, I hope wee shall heare of it another time: for hitherto you haue onely said, but shewed nothing. As for those words, that *Bishops are to bee abandoned as enemies of Christs soueraigne authority &c.* they sauour more of passion then reason, and deserue rather to bee pitied then answered. The eigth argument.

8 *Because*

1.Cor.12.27. 28.Eph.4.11. 12, 13.

8 *Because God onely must haue this preeminence to dispose the members euery one of them in the body of the Church at his owne pleasure: so as either it must bee shewed that God hath placed the Hierarchie of Arch-bishops, Bishops, Priests, or they are not to bee set vp or retained or approued.*

We haue satisfyed you in this already, if happily you will bee satisfied. For wee haue shewed, first that the Ministrie of Arch-bishops, Bishops and Priests is of diuine and Apostolicall institution: and secondly, if the superiority of Bishops bee not immediatly from God, yet being not forbidden, and tending to edification, the Church vnder God hath power to ordaine them. Hereunto wee expect your answer. The ninth argument.

Mat. 21. 25. 26. Ep. 4. 8. 11. 12. Pſ. 68. 18 Ro. 14. 23. Heb. 11. 16.

9 *Because none can of Faith ioyne vnto the Hierarchie aforesaid, because they are not warranted by the Word, being not from Heauen but from the earth.*

The Ministrie aforesaid is warranted by Gods Word, as wee haue oftentimes said, and so is from Heauen not from earth: and therefore you may of Faith ioyne vnto it. Had it not been a plant of Gods owne setting, doubtlesse it would haue beene rooted out of the Church long since, and not haue continued fifteen hundred yeeres together. The tenth argument.

10 *Because*

10 *Because none can submit vnto or haue spirituall commu-* Rev.14.9.10.
nion with the Hierarchie and Ministrie aforesaid, but 11.
hee shall worship the Beast and his image, spoken of in the Reuelation, and receiue his marke in his forehead or hand: and so make himselfe subiect to the wrath of God.

This argument though differing in words, yet in sence and meaning is all one with the first. For how can it bee conceiued that they who submit themselues vnto our Ministrie worship, as you say, the Beast and his Image, vnlesse it be for that it is Antichristian? For auoiding of *Tautologie* therefore, I referre you vnto the answer of that argument, where I plainely demonstrate that it is Christian not Antichristian: so that in communicating with it, there can bee no danger either of worshipping the Beasts-image, or receiuing his marke, or incurring the wrath of God. But whereas you talke of worshipping the Beast, you much mistake the matter. For by the Beast is vnderstood not Antichrist but the Roman Empire whereof the State of Antichrist is the image. Neither can you shew, if our Ministrie were Antichristian, how by retaining it wee should worship the Roman Empire. The eleuenth argument.

Rev.18.4.5.6 2.Cor.16.17. 18.Ioh.10.5. Num.16.1. 26.40.18.4. 5.Ezech 44.7. 18.4.5.Mat. 15.13.Es.11. 4.&.13.& 14.Ier.15.& 50.&.51.2. Thes.2.3.4. 8.Rev.14.6.7. 8.&.17.& 18.&19.

11 *Because all are straitly bound and charged by the Lord to depart from and witnesse against the aforesaid Prelacy and Priest-hood being a strange Ministrie, and such as is opposed against and exalted aboue the holy ordinance and Ministrie of Christ, and shall be abolished by him appearing in the light and power of the Gospell.*

Our Ministrie neither is a strange Ministrie, nor opposed

poſed or exalted aboue Chriſts Miniſtrie, but Chriſts owne Miniſtrie, as now once againe I tell you: and therefore no man is charged either to depart from it, or to witneſſe againſt it. But you are a ſtrange diſputer, who ſo peremptorily affirme that which hath euer beene denied, and neuer goe about to proue it. As for that you ſay our Miniſtrie ſhall bee aboliſhed by Chriſt appearing in the light and power of the Goſpell, it bewrayes what you deſire ſhould bee, but is no certaine Oracle of what indeed ſhall be. Sure I am our Miniſtrie hath ſubſiſted this fifteen hundred yeeres, and the light and power of the Goſpell hitherto hath not aboliſhed it, but it hath ſtill publiſhed and propagated the Goſpell. Happily when the Church ſhall ceaſe to be militant, and Chriſt ſhall deliuer vp the Kingdome to his Father, that God may be all in all, this miniſtrie ſhall haue an end. But till then, *Credat Iudæus Apella, Non ego*, let *Browniſts and Barowiſts* believe it, not I. Your obſtinate begging of the principall matter in queſtion conuinceth you to bee but a bad diſputant, and this raſh and vnaduiſed prediction now dubbeth you for a falſe Prophet alſo. The laſt argument.

2. King. 23. 5. Pſ. 101. Pro. 16. 10. 11. 12. 25. 2. 5. Reu. 17. 16. Deu. 17. 18. 19. 20. Ro. 12. 7. 8. Eph. 4. 11. 13. 1. Tim. 3. &. 5. 9. 17. 6. 13. 14

12 *Becauſe it is the dutie and in the power of Princes to ſuppreſſe and root out of their dominions all falſe Miniſtries: and therefore theſe as well as Abbots, Friers, Nuns, Cardinals, &c. Whereas it is not in their power, or of any vnder Heauen to aboliſh the offices giuen by Chriſt to his Church.*

Here againe you take for granted that our Miniſtrie is but a falſe Miniſtrie, and that Arch-biſhops, Biſhops, and

and Priests are no lesse Antichristian then Abbots, Friers, Nuns, Cardinals, which is euer denied but neuer confirmed by you. Vaine man, proue our Ministrie to bee false, and wee will grant it is to be rooted out: otherwise outfacing and desperate asseueration will not serue the turne.

And thus haue I briefly examined all your twelue reasons whereby you goe about to proue the Minor of your principall Syllogisme, namely that our Church-officers Arch-bishops, Bishops and Priests are not to be set ouer nor retained in the Church. Whereupon I inferre, seeing your Maior is barely affirmed being vntrue, and your Minor so weakly and insufficiently proued: you haue not as yet soundly concluded the lawfulnesse and necessity of your separation. Let vs proceed to the second ground which you cõceiue in these words,

A true visible Church is a company of people called and separated from the world by the Word of God, and ioyned together by voluntary profession of the Faith of Christ in the Fellowship of the Gospell. Out of which if I mistake not you would conclude the iustnes of your separation thus. Act. 2. 39. 19. 9. Ro. 1. 6. 7. 10. 14. 15. 16. Iob. 17. 14. 20. Ezek. 36. 38. Phil. 1. 5. Act. 2. 41: 42. 47. 11. 21. 24. 13. 4. 34. Ro. 12. 5. 2. Cor. 9. 13. Ps. 110. 13. Es. 14. 1. 44. 5. 60. 8. Zach. 4. 6. 8. 21. 22. 23.

Where there is not a company of people called and separated from the world and ioyned together as aboue, there is not a true visible Church, and consequently Separation ought to be made from it.

But in England there is not a company of people so called and separated from the world, and so ioined together.

Ergo, in England there is not a true visible Church, and consequently separation ought to bee made from it.

I distinguish of the middle tearme Called: for there is

a double calling, the one is *Gratiæ oblatæ*, where by God onely inuites men vnto Christ, and offers them Grace, the other *Gratiæ inditæ & infusæ*, whereby hee not only offers but infuseth grace also into them. The former Calling maketh not a man of the Church: for hee that is no otherwise called, answereth not by Faith, nor commeth vnto Christ, but remaineth still in infidelity, and so is vtterly excluded out of the Church. Of the latter Calling I distinguish againe, for it is either that whereby hee bestoweth vpon man Faith of Doctrine, or that whereby ouer and aboue hee giues them Iustification together with true Sanctification. Faith of Doctrine is either a Partiall or an Entire Faith: a Partiall Faith whereby part onely of the Christian verity is held, or an Entire Faith by which the whole saving truth is beliued and professed: And this againe either in Vnity or in Schisme, in Vnity with other Churches of God, or in Schisme with Separation from them. Now all these and euer yone of them are of the Christian Church: for they are neither Gentiles, nor Iewes, nor Turks, being by the calling of grace brought to the profession of the Christian Religion. But yet among them there is exceeding great difference: for they that hold the entire truth of Christ are of that Christian Church, which is called Oxthodoxall: they that hold it in part onely, are of that Christian Church which is Hereticall. They that entirely hold the truth in Vnity with other Churches of God, are of that Christian Orthodoxall Church which is Catholicke: they that hold the same whole truth in Separation from them are of that Christian Orthodoxall Church which is Schismaticall. And such is the Church of Brownists to which you haue adioyned your selfe.

selfe. But they who hold the whole truth of Christ not onely in Vnity but also in Sincerity, being truly iustified by Faith and Sanctified in the lauour of Regeneration, & they I say are of that Christian Orthodoxall Catholicke Church which is Inuisible and knowne only vnto God. For although both the persons and profession of those that are thus called, be visible, and may by outward sense bee discerned, whereby in the eye of Charity they are to bee counted Gods elect people: yet the inward truth and sincerity of the heart is to vs inuisible, and seene of none but onely him who trieth the heart and raines, and so alone knoweth who are his.

These distinctions thus promised I come at length to answer your Syllogisme, and demand of you which of these Callings it is that you meane. If the last, whereby wee haue receiued entirely to beleiue the whole truth of Christ, and that not onely in Vnity, but also in Sincerity and with a sanctified heart: then I deny the Maior, for it is not the Visible but the Inuisible Church alone δ. that cõsists of such members. Neither can such a Visible Church bee found vpon the face of the earth: for here γ. corne and cockle, chaffe and wheat, Saints and hypochrits are mingled together, neither can you affirme other of that Church whereunto now you associate your selfe. If you meane any other of the Callings aboue mentioned, or all of them besides this last, then I deny your Minor. For here in England wee are a company of people to whom not onely grace hath beene offered, but who also haue receiued grace to beleiue the truth of Christ, and therefore are not Infidels but of the Church of Christ. Againe we haue receiued to beleiue the whole truth, and therefore are an Oxthodoxall not an Hereti-

call Church. Lastly, wee hold the whole truth of God in Unity with other Churches, and amongst vs there are thousands also who professe the same with sincere and sanctified hearts, and therefore wee are not a Schismaticall as you are, but a true Catholicke Church. This Minor thus denied you goe not about to strengthen with so much as one argument, and yet hither should you haue bent all your forces. About the Maior you bestow a little more paines, endeuouring to fortify it with sixe reasons: which although they bee to little purpose, yet to giue you the more satisfaction, let vs briefly examine them. And first that which is in order first.

1.Cor.12.27. Exod.19.5.6. 1.Cor.14.33. 1. Tim. 3.15. Mat. 13. 24. 31. Psal. 46. 4. 5. 80. 1. 1. Pet. 2.5.9.Rev. 11. 12.13.20.

1. *Because a true visible Church is the body of Christ, a Kingdome of Priests, a Church of Saints, the houshold of God, the Kingdome of heauen, the Citie of God, the sheep of the Lord, a chosen generation, a golden Candlestick &c.*

These titles properly belong vnto the inuisible Church consisting of those who are effectually called by sauing grace. And when they are said & affirmed of any visible Church, you must vnderstand that the denomination is in regard of the better part thereof, namely those Saints who haue receiued the spirit of adoption, the earnest penny of their euerlasting inheritance, not that no euill men are mixed with them. In *Corinth* and *Galatia* as there were many holy and faithfull seruants of God, so were there many lewd and vngodly men also: for it is well knowen that they were much pestered both with error in doctrine, and corruption in manners. And yet the *Apostle* S. *Paul* neuer sticketh at it to acknowledge the m

them visible Churches: which I am sure he would not haue done, had he thought that the mixture of bad and good in the same society did nullify a Church. Nay rather if he had beene of your humour he would haue aduized a separation.

Heb. 3. 1, 2, 3. & 5, 6, 9. & 12. 28. Mat. 28. 18. 19. 20. Psal. 110. 1. 4. 1. Pet. 2. 4, 5. 25. Act. 2. 41. 47. Eph. 1. 22. 23. 2. 19. 22. Heb. 12. 23.

1. *How should it els haue Christ for the Prophet, Priest, & King thereof? or how should men know where to ioine and become members of the body of Christ, with assurance to haue him their head? &c.*

It is the *Inuisible Church, the Church of the first borne*, as S. *Paul* calleth it, whose names *are enrolled in heauen*, vnto which Christ properly and vniuocally is a *Prophet, Priest, and King*. For he is a *Head* in such manner vnto those only who are knit together with him in the same mysticall body by the vnity of the same spirit, and to whom hee communicateth from himselfe the sweet influence of life, sense, motion, euen *grace for grace*, as S. *Iohn* speaketh. Is he not then a *Head* also of the visible Church? yes, as it is a Church: it is a Church equiuocally, and so is *Christ* the *Head* thereof. For hypocrits and wicked men mingled with the good are not members of Christ, as *Ambrose* saith, but of the diuell, and therefore Christ properly is not their *Head*, *Head* and *Body* being *Correlatiues*. Who are Elected and by true Iustifying Faith are ingrafted into Christs body you may charitably iudge, but cannot certenly know: for God only knoweth who are his. Neuertheles where you see a Society of men professing entirely and in vnity the truth of Christ, ioine your selfe vnto them, knowing that they are a *Christian orthodoxall Catholick Church*.

Ioh. 1. 16.

And

And assure your selfe that there are among them sundry who are the deare Saints of God and professe the truth in sincerity and vprightnes of heart also: which if you shall do together with them, you need not doubt but you shall haue Christ to be your head.

Mat. 28. 18. 19. 20. 2. Cor. 6. 17. 18. Lev. 26. 11. 12. Ps. 46. 4. 5. Es. 59. 20, 21. Ez. 37. 27. 28. & 48. 35.

3. *How should it els haue assurance of the promises & seales of Gods Couenant, presence, and blessing to belong and appertaine vnto them?*

The promises of Christ are proclaimed in such mixed companies vnto all on condition of faith & repentance, though actually performed vnto those only who actually haue performed the condition by repenting and beleeuing. And to these the Seales of the *Couenant* of *grace*, the presence of God, & his blessings do appertaine also. If then you would bee assured that both the promises & seales belong vnto you, ioine your selfe to such companies, and performe the condition with them, and the *Spirit* of adoption will certifie and assure you thereof. If you will not, you must seek out of the world, or hang euer in doubt: for in the world there are none but such companies.

Act. 2. 41. 42. 47. 11. 21. 24. 18. 27. Mat. 18. 17. 20. 1. Cor. 5. 4. 5. 12. 13. Ps. 149. 9.

4. *How els should it haue or vse the power of Christ to receiue in members ioyning vnto them, or to cast out such as are obstinate offenders?*

It is true there is a power giuen by Christ vnto the Church to receiue into their Society such as professe the entire Faith of Christ in Vnity: but whether they professe the same in sincerity also, that the Church cannot tell,

tell, and yet receiues them. Againe shee hath power to censure and cast out obstinate offenders: but yet hereby it appeares that the Church visible is a mingled cõpany, and that offenders are to bee accounted members thereof vntill by a legall proceeding they be cut off. Suppose that the Church grow remisse in denouncing offenders, and tolerate them too much: this argues that corruption is crept into the Church, not that is no Church.

5. *Because that euery Church as they haue Communion with Christ, and are one body with him: so haue they Communion also one with another, and are all one body: and by communion with open wicked retained among them are all defiled.*

1. Cor. 10. 16. 17. Hag. 2, 12. 14. 1. Cor. 5. 6. Num. 19. 13. 20. 22. & 5. 3. 3. Heb. 12. 15.

The members of euery Church haue (I grant) both Vnion and Communion one with another: the Christian Church in the Christian Faith, the Orthodoxall Church in the entire Christian Faith, the Catholicke Church in the entire Christian Faith with Vnity, the Inuisible Church in the entire Christian Faith with Vnity and Sanctity. This last Vnion and Communion is onely among the Saints, the former may bee both betweene good and bad, that if you speake of, you speake not of a Visible Church, and so nothing to the purpose: this if you speake of, you speake vntruly, as wee haue shewed.

Moreouer, to say that the toleration or presence of open wicked sinners in the Church defiles either the godly or the holy things of the godly, is to make the sin of the wicked more powerfull to hinder the descent of heauenly blessings, then Christs loue and vnion with vs is auayleable to conuay them vnto vs. And then was

Christ much to blame, who suffered the Sacrament euen at the first institution to be polluted with *Iudas* presence. But you should consider that priuate conuersation is one thing, and publicke Church-meetings another; which you ignorantly confounding beguile your selfe. Priuatly you may refuse at pleasure to conuerse with the wicked: in publike assemblies you cannot auoid them. That is in your owne power, but to remoue them thence is in the Magistrats only.

Ps. 84. 10. Cant. 16. 7. Os. 2. 2. 19. 20. 2. Cor. 6. 15. Reu. 1. 11. 12. 20. 17. 1. 5.

6 How else should a true and visible Church bee truly and rightly distinguished from all false Churches?

Here at length haue you discouered vnto vs the very ground of your errour, in that you cannot see how a true visible Church can bee distinguished from a false, if notorious offenders bee suffered to haue any communion therein. Learne then that true and false Churches are differenced by hauing or wanting the forme and essence 1. of a Church. The Christian Church is discerned from Heathnish, Iewish, Turkish congregations by the 2. Christian Faith; an Orthodoxe Church from an Hereticall by an entire Faith: a Catholicke from a Schismaticall by an entire Faith held in Unity: and the Inuisible 4. Church from all other by the Sanctity of euery member: but this is knowne to God only, the rest may bee discerned by man also. You ought therefore to put a difference between a Corrupt Church and a false Church. A false Church wanteth the essence and therefore is no Church: a corrupt Church wanteth onely the purity it should haue, yet hauing the essence it is a Church. Which if you had well considered you would not haue condemned

ned our Church (if yet so corrupt as you weene) for no Church, vnlesse you would also say a sicke man were no man: much lesse would you haue rent your selfe from it.

And thus you see your second ground faites you also, and that you haue not demonstrated that sound members are to separate themselues from the communion of the whole body because of a few rotten mẽbers. Now therfore except you haue stronger arguments then here you haue sent me, or can adde more strength and vertue to these: I must intreate you to remember your promise that if it could appeare by euident remonstrance that your grounds were sandy & deceitfull, you would retire your selfe into the bosome of that Church out of which you haue so scandalously withdrawne your selfe. Which if you shall sincerely doe, you shall both quit your selfe of the fearfull sin of Schisme into which you are fallen, and reunite your selfe vnto as glorious a Church, as I verily beleeue hath beene since the Apostolicall and Primitiue times.

Remember from whence thou art fallen and repent. Reuel. 2. 5.

OF VOWES AND SPECIALLY THAT OF VIRGINITY.

YOVR desire to bee resolued touching the vow of Virginity or Single life, both how lawfull it is, & how farre it bindes. I will endeauour to satisfie you as breefly and plainly as I can: first shewing you what is the nature and definition of a vow in generall, and then applying it vnto your particular question for the more easie and fuller determination thereof.

1. A vow rightly defined is *a promise made vnto God of things lawfull, by such as haue power so to doe, thereby to testify their affection and duty towards him.* This short definition containing the whole and entire nature of a lawfull Vow, I will for your better vnderstanding vnfold in the seuerall parts thereof.

2. I call it a Promise not a Purpose: for a Purpose being only an inclination of the minde to do something,

binds

binds not vnto performance, and is alterable without sin: But a Promise comprehendeth both a Purpose and Obligation also, binding the Conscience vnto performance: absolutely, if the forme of the Promise be absolute, conditionally if conditionall.

3. And this promise whether it be internally conceiued in the heart or externally vttered by the mouth, it is all one vnto God, who vnderstandeth as well the language of the one as of the other. Yet as in Praying so in Vowing speech is not vnprofitable, the solemnity thereof both more inwardly affecting our selues, and by example more edifying others.

4. The Party to whom Vowes are to bee directed is God only: for it is a part of diuine worship, and enioyned in the third commandement. A part of diuine worship I say simply if it bee of things commanded, if of things indifferent accidentally only, inasmuch as it is referred to the worship of God, and therefore cannot without sacriledge be giuen to any creature.

5. How then can the Popish Church vowing vnto Saints quit herselfe of notorious Idolatrie? specially seing by the confession of Molanus a principall champion of hers, a Vow is an act of latria, that is of such worship as is due vnto God. Neither can she cloake her Superstition, with any shew of Scripture: for Bellarmin himselfe freely acknowledgeth, that *when the holy Scriptures were written, the custome of vowing vnto Saints was not yet begun.* Theol. Pract. comp. tract. 2. c. 8. art. 33. De cult. Sanct. c. 9.

6. The matter of a vow is things lawfull, whether they be necessary as being commanded, or arbitrary as being neither forbidden nor commanded. For that duties commanded may be vowed appeareth euen by the

vow in Baptiſme. And although vertues, as Chryſoſtom ſaith, *be due vnto God albeit they be not promiſed:* yet what letteth but what God bindeth vs vnto by precept, we by vow as by a new knot may alſo bind our ſelues vnto.

In Pſal. 46.

7. *Bellarmin* indeed is bold and affirmeth that it is *the common opinion of Diuines, that the Promiſe in Baptiſme is not properly a vow:* but *Azorius* his fellow-*Ieſuite* can tell him otherwiſe, *that the ancient Diuines together with the Maſter of the Sentences ſeeme to thinke that Baptiſme is a vow properly and truly ſo called.*

De Monach. c. 19.

Inſtit. Mor. l. 11. c. 14.

8. That things of an indifferent and middle nature may alſo be Vowed is granted of all hands, God hauing permitted vnto the Church and members thereof iudgement and diſpenſation of them. Yet this muſt be vnderſtood with caution: for ſeeing as Saint *Paul* ſaith, *thoſe things that are lawfull are not alwayes expedient*, and things otherwiſe lawfull may in regard of circumſtance become vnlawfull, thoſe indifferent things that are inueſted with ſuch circumſtances ceaſe during the while to be the matter of a Vow.

9. Iuſtly therefore are excluded from being the matter of a Vow, firſt all ſuch actions as are in their owne nature euill, next ſuch as hinder a greater good, then thoſe that croſſe the generall Vow made in Baptiſme, farther ſuch as are impoſſible and out of our power, moreouer ſuch as are friuolous and vnprofitable, finally thoſe things that are naturally neceſſary, and if there be any other beſides of the like quality.

10. I adde farther by ſuch as haue power ſo to doe: for none may Vow but they who by their vocation haue liberty thereunto. Now this vocation in regard of things commanded extendeth vniuerſally vnto all, and there-

fore

fore it is free for euery man to vow them. But in respect of things indifferent it stretcheth not so farre: For first they who by reason of age or distemper haue not the vse of reason or iudgment, secondly they who are vnder the authority, and iurisdiction of others, hauing not power of themselues because of their calling may not nor cannot lawfully vow without the consent and good liking of their superiors. Num. 30.

11. This condemnes the impious practice of Popish Friers, who inueigle yong youths from the obedience of their parents, and without their consents intangle them in the vow of Monasticall life, treading directly in the steps of their Great-grand-father *Eustathius*, against whose wicked doctrine the Councell of *Gangra* thus decreed, *If any children shall forsake their Parents especially being faithfull vpon occasion of Religion thinking it iust so to doe, and shall not rather performe due honor vnto them, reuerencing euen this in them that they are faithfull let them be accursed.* Can. 16.

12. Finally the End of a Vow is partly to testify our affection to God, as namely our thankfulnesse for benefits receiued: and partly our duty in carefulnesse to preuent sinne, and to preserue and increase Gods graces in vs. In a word it serues as an instrument or helping meanes to further our obedience to Gods Lawes. And because the End it selfe is of greater importance then the meanes conducing vnto the End, surely Obedience must needs bee better then Sacrifice, that is, then the Vow which fitteth only vnto it.

13. The *Romish Church* therefore teaching that vowes are of greater perfection in this life, and deserue an higher degree of glory in the next, then the very works of

of the Morall law, cannot be excuſed of manifeſt blaſphemie. Which it ſeemes *Cardinal Cajetan* alſo ſaw when he ſaid, that *Chriſt preſcribeth no vow to him that will obtaine perfection of life: becauſe the obtaining of perfection conſiſteth not in the bonds of vowes but in the works themſelues.*

Comment. in Mat. 19.

14. This being the true nature and definition of a vow, I conclude as touching the Obligation or bond thereof, that euery vow thus made vnto God, in ſuch Forme, of ſuch Matter, by ſuch Perſons, to ſuch End, as wee haue ſaid, bindeth the Conſcience vnto performance: in ſo much as the breach thereof is no leſſe then mortall ſin, and very diſhonorable vnto God. For if lawfull promiſes are to bee held with men, much more with God. And *if we bee ſlack to pay them hee will ſurely require them of us, and ſo ſhould it be ſin vnto us.*

Pſal. 15.

Deut. 23. 21.

15. But what if a man haue raſhly vowed that which is vnlawfull? Surely in ſuch a caſe it is better to retract the vow, then by keeping it to adde ſin vnto ſin. For a vow, ſaith the Canon, may not be the bond of iniquity: and excellently to this purpoſe counſelleth *Philo* the *Iew, Let ſuch a one therefore abſtaine*, ſaith he, and *humbly entreat God of his Clemency to pardon the vnaduiſed raſhnes wherby he was ſo headlong carried to ſweare: for to double the offence when thou mayſt diſcharge thy ſelfe of the one halfe, is extreame madnes, and ſcarcely euer curable.*

De leg. ſpec.

16. Now let vs apply what hath beene ſaid vnto the particular vow of virginity, or ſingle life. And firſt whereas nothing may be the Matter of a vow but that which is lawfull, and things lawfull are of two ſorts, either ſimply and morally good, or arbitrary and indifferent:

1. 2.

ferent: ſurely Virginity cannot be ranked in the firſt order. For to vſe no other then *Gerſons* reaſons, Morall vertues are commanded, and are not deſtroyed but by vice, and being loſt may bee recouered by repentance. But Virginity is no where commanded, and is deſtroyed by Matrimony which is no ſinne (although Pope *Syricius* heretically call it vncleanneſſe and pollution of the fleſh) and being loſt cannot poſſibly be recouered. And therefore howſoeuer it may giue a kind of luſter and grace vnto vertue, yet vertue it can be none. P. 3. de Conſil. Euang. & ſtat. perfect.

17. Hereupon it followeth that Virginity and Mariage are not in themſelues acceptable vnto God one more then another, but that it is the mind which rightly vſeth both the one and the other which is pleaſing vnto him: and that they are rather diuers ſorts of life, then differences or degrees of liuing better or worſe. Specially, ſeeing as *Gregory Nazianzen* ſaith, *A man may in mariage attaine as great glory of vertue as in Virginity or ſingle life.* In a word it is onely a matter of indifferencie. In laud Baſil.

10. And being indifferẽt, although in it ſelfe to be lawfull and free, yet (according to the nature of indifferent things) circumſtance may alter the lawfulneſſe and freedome of it vnto particular perſons. As namely to thoſe who want either the Calling, or the Gift: the Gift by which they know themſelues able to containe, the Calling by which they are in their owne power, and to diſpoſe of themſelues for their ſtate of life.

19. That euery one hath not the Calling becauſe it is euident, I will ſpare labour to proue it. That euery one hath not the gift, our Sauiour Chriſt himſelfe witneſſeth ſaying, *All men cannot receiue this ſaying but they to whom* Mat. 19. 11.

it is giuen, and againe, *Hee that is able to receiue this let him receiue it*: and Saint *Paul*, *Euery man hath his proper gift of God*, and it *hee cannot containe*. Whereupon *Saint Hierome*, *If all could bee Virgins our Lord Chriſt would neuer haue ſaid, Hee that can receiue it, let him receiue it*: otherwiſe as Saint *Auguſtin* ſaith, *Hee might haue ſaid, All receiue not this ſaying but they that will, if it be true which they ſay.*

1. Cor. 7. 7. 9.

Contr. Iouin. l. 1.

Contr. Iulian. l. 5. c. 10.

20. Now they that want the Calling and yet Vow ſo, tranſgreſſe the fift Commandement withdrawing their obedience from their ſuperiors in thoſe things wherein they owe obedience. In regard whereof S. *Auguſtin* ſharply reproueth *Editia* for *Vowing* continency without her husbands conſent. And they that want the Gift ſo doing intolerably abuſe, and in moſt preſumptuous manner tempt the Diuine Maieſty, promiſing vnto him impoſſibilities, or which they are not aſſured they can performe. So that vnto thoſe which either want liberty by reaſon of the Calling, or ability in reſpect of the Gift, ſuch a Vow is vtterly vnlawfull.

Ep. 199.

21. But perhaps you will ſay, the Gift may bee obtained by Faſting and Prayer, Chriſt himſelfe hauing thus promiſed, *Aske and you ſhall haue*. Firſt grant it bee ſo, yet is it very prepoſterous firſt to vow, and then to ſeeke for the Gift: for as *Salomon* ſaith, *It is a ſnare for a man after the vow to make inquirie*. Otherwiſe I deny not but a man may vow Continence if hee be already aſſured of the Gift, and that he can containe.

Pro. 20. 25.

22. Neither doth it follow that euery one which by Prayer ſeeketh the Gift ſhall obtaine it. For the promiſe is to bee vnderſtood of thoſe neceſſary gifts without which there is no ſaluation, and not of thoſe extraordinary

nary & peculiar gifts, the want of which no way hindereth ſaluation. Thoſe if we aske in Faith wee ſhall ſurely obtaine: theſe if we aske we haue no aſſurãce to obtaine, becauſe wee may bee ſaued without them. Surely *Gregory Nazianzen* much complayneth of the inordinate boyling of his luſts in his old age, which he had happily repreſſed in his youth. And *Hierome* alſo confeſſeth that notwithſtanding hee had beene the companion of ſcorpions and wild beaſts in the wilderneſſe, notwithſtanding his face was pale with faſting, his body cold, and his fleſh dead, yet the fires & heats of luſt ſtill were burning in him.

In carm. de rebus ſuis & decalam animæ ſuæ. Ad Euſtoch. de cuſtod. virg.

23. But ſaith Doctor Biſhop, Continency is neceſſary to ſaluation vnto all thoſe that haue Vowed it: for the breach of the Vow is diſhonour vnto God, and damnation vnto themſelues, and therefore being neceſſary, wee ſhall vſing the meanes aſſuredly obtaine it. This is right to ſubiect the prouidence of God in the diſpenſation of theſe peculiar gifts vnto our temerity and raſhnes. I beſeech you, if a man haue vowed to propheſie, or to ſpeake with ſtrange tongues, or to worke miracles, muſt God needs beſtow thoſe gifts vpon him vpon his importunate ſuite, leaſt otherwiſe hee ſhould breake his vow, and hazard his ſaluation?

24. Nay rather let ſuch a one humbly repent and beg pardon for his raſhneſſe, that hee hath ſo vnaduiſedly entangled himſelfe in ſuch a deſperate ſnare: and let him in the Name of God vſe the remedy which God hath appointed; that is as Saint *Paul* ſaith, to marrie, For ſaith he, *If they cannot containe, let them marrie: for it is better to marrie then to burne.* 1. Cor. 7. 9.

25. This indeed, they ſay, is good and wholeſome

counſell for others: but as for Votaries, it is a greater
Sleid.com.l.4. ſinne, ſaith Cardinall *Campegius*, for them to marrie then to keep many whores at home. A Prieſt marrying, ſaith *Coſter*, ſinneth more grieuouſly then if hee keep a
Ench. c. 15. Concubine. Both are euill to marry and to burne, ſaith *Bellarmine*, but the worſe of the two is to marry. Thus you ſee, hauing once paſt the bounds of modeſtie, how egregiouſly impudent and ſhameleſſe they are growne.

l. 1. ep. 11. 26. But of a farre different opinion was *Cyprian*, *If they who haue dedicated themſelues to Chriſt cannot or will not perſeuere, it is better for them to marrie, then*
Hær. 61. A. poſtolici. *through wantonneſſe to fall into the fire.* And *Epiphanius*, *Better is it for a man that is fallen from his courſe* of virginity or ſingle life, *publickely according to the law to take a wife vnto him, and a long time to repent him of falling from virginity, and ſo to be reſtored into the Church againe, and not dayly to bee wounded with ſecret darts, by the wickedneſſe which the Diuell bringeth vpon him. Thus the Church vſeth to teach and with theſe medicines ſhee healeth.* The ſame is the counſell both of *Hierome* and *Auguſtin*.

27. And what madneſſe is it for a man hauing inconſiderately vowed that which he cannot performe, not to remedy himſelfe by marriage which is the ordinance of God, but by fornication, whoredome, and vnnaturall *Sodomitrie*, which are the works of the Diuell? Is not this with the old Giants furiouſly to warre againſt God himſelfe? And what barbarous cruelty is it ſo to tyrannize ouer the Conſciences of men in regard of their vnauoidable infirmities, that either they muſt inwardly burne in the ſcorching flames of filthy luſt, or quenching them with the ſins of fornication or adultery or that which is worſe thruſt themſelues headlong into the vnquenchable

quenchable fire of Hell? But were it not for this doctrine of Diuels wee ſhould want one principall argument to proue that Church to be Antichriſtian.

28. Which Antichriſt, together with his Diuelliſh doctrines, as thou haſt already begun to conſume with the blaſt of thy mouth: ſo *Come Lord Ieſu come quickly*, that thou maiſt finally alſo abolish them with the brightneſſe of thy comming. In the meane ſeaſon of thy goodneſſe either grant vs the Gift, or ſanctifie the meanes vnto vs, that keeping our ſelues cleane both in body and ſoule, wee may bee preſented vnto thee as pure and vnſpotted Virgins in the laſt day. *Amen.*

A LETTER.

INstead of a few words which I promiſed to write you, I haue here ſent this little treatiſe, which if you diligently read and peruſe, it will more fully informe and reſolue you then I ſhould haue done. Neuertheleſſe, that I may in ſome ſort diſcharge my promiſe, and not altogether faile your expectation, in few words thus. I would wiſh you diligently to remember that to bee grieued and troubled for ſinne is a neceſſary duty, and that it ought to be ſo. For as in the poole of *Bethesda* there could bee no cure wrought vntill the Angell had troubled the water: ſo neither is there any remiſſion of ſinnes and healing of the ſoule, vntill by the worke of Gods Spirit the heart bee bruzed and broken. When ſuch an Angell as *Peter* was, ſhall by his powerfull preaching haue pricked the Conſcience, and made men both to ſee their ſinne, and to feele the miſery thereof: then and not before doe they crie out, *Men and Brethren what ſhall wee doe?* Sorrow for ſinne is a bleſſed ſorrow. A broken and contrite ſpirit God neuer yet deſpiſed. Thoſe, and thoſe alone who feele the heauy

loade and burden of their ſinnes doth Chriſt inuite vnto him, and vnto them doth hee promiſe refreſhment. Hee that oftentimes watered his couch with his teares, and as often taſted the ſweet conſolations of Gods bleſſed Spirit, hath out of his experience ſeriouſly affirmed that whoſoeuer ſoweth in teares ſhall ſurely reap in ioy, and a day of reioycing ſhall euer ſucceed the night of mourning. And to ſpeake the truth, ſorrow was made for nothing but for ſinne. A potion is made onely for that diſeaſe which it is able to cure: and ſorrow for that onely which it is able to remedie. Loſſe of friends, health, wealth and the like were neuer yet recouered with weeping: but the teares of true repentance haue euer cleanſed the ſoule from ſinne, and purchaſed both pardon and fauour from God. Sorrow therefore was made onely for ſinne. Mourne then in Gods name for your ſinnes: but yet take heed you mourne not as thoſe that are without hope. You cannot doe a greater wrong vnto the infinite mercy of God, and the inualuable merits of Chriſt your Sauiour, then to thinke them leſſe then your ſinnes or demerits. If Satan ſuggeſt any ſuch thing vnto you, ſpare him not, but tell him hee lies: for Gods goodnes cannot bee outreached by mans wickednesſe, and where ſinne doth abound, grace doth much more abound. If your ſinnes were as red as ſcarlet, yet vpon your true repentance God both can and will make you as white as ſnow: And of your repentance you cannot well make doubt, there being in you, as you haue confeſſed vnto mee, both hearty ſorrow for ſinnes paſt, and vnfained reſolution of amendement for the time to come, which are the two eſſentiall parts of true repentance. Yea but you haue committed that ſinne which is vnto death and

can:

can neuer bee forgiuen nor in this nor in the next world. If ſo, to what end doe you ſeeke vnto mee for comfort? And why doe I waſt paper in writing vnto you? But vpon what ground haue you entertayned this conceit? Forſooth you haue often ſworne and forſworne againſt your knowledge. I will not extenuate your ſin: it is I confeſſe grieuous and fearefull, neither would I willingly hinder you from a long pennance in ſackcloth and aſhes for the ſame. Howbeit I would aduiſe you to ſteere right betweene theſe two dangerous gulfes: for as you muſt not make mole-hils of mountaines, nor frailties of furies, ſo neither muſt you of euery ſinne, though otherwiſe heinous and enormious make that vnpardonable ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt. It is not often ſwearing or curſing, no nor forſwearing or periury and the like, which God neither can nor will forgiue. For then what ſhould become of that worthy Apoſtle Saint *Peter*, who forſwore his Lord and Sauiour, euen againſt his Conſcience, and that not once but thrice, with moſt horrible execration and curſing? you haue not ſinned in ſo high a nature as *Peter* did, neuertheleſſe now that Chriſt looketh backe vpon you as hee did on him, touching your heart with conſideration of what you haue done, I giue you good leaue to goe foorth with him and to weep as bitterly as you can. But deſpaire not of pardon, nor count it the ſinne againſt the Holy Ghoſt, for ſo did not hee. That ſinne is no leſſe then a wilfull, malicious, and obſtinate denying of the foundation, namely that Ieſus is the Mediator and Redeemer of the world. It is a totall apoſtaſie from the Faith, when the whole man reuolteth from the whole Chriſtian Religion wholly, with an obſtinate reſolution neuer to returne to it any more. This

Sin against H. Gh. described.

ſinne

ſinne I know you are farre from, and you dare not ſay you haue committed it. Neither is it poſſible for him that is guilty thereof to doe as you now a long time haue done, that is to mourne and lament for his ſinnes. His ſtubborne and reprobate heart is not ſo tender, but being paſt all ſorrow and feeling rather reioyceth in his deſperate and malicious obſtinacy. More I might write, but let this little booke I ſend you bee inſteed thereof. It remayneth that henceforward you play the valiant ſouldier of Chriſt, and ſuffer not your ſelfe any longer to be led by paſſion, but onely by the rules and directions of Gods bleſſed Word. For my part I will not ceaſe to pray vnto the Father of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt for you, that this pricke may be eftſoones taken from you: or if for you further exerciſe and triall hee delay you a little longer, that yet your Faith may ſettle and reſt vpon that anſwer which God gaue vnto *Paul* being in the like caſe, *My grace is ſufficient for thee. Farewell.*

THE BLESSED

VIRGIN MARY
IS TRVLY
Deipara, the Mother of GOD.

THis Propoſition either in expreſſe or equiualent tearmes hath euer been held by all *Orthodoxe* writers both ancient and moderne: ſpecially thoſe who haue liued ſince *Neſtorius* broached the contrary hereſie. This *Neſtorius* about foure hundred yeeres after Chriſt was Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who when his Chaplaine *Anaſtaſius* had publickly taught, that the bleſſed Virgin *Mary* ought not to bee called the *Mother of God*, was ſo farre, ſaith *Socrates*,

L. 7. c. 32. from checking in him these blasphemies against Christ, that hee maintained him in it, and reiected himselfe the
Euagr. l. 1. c. 7. word *Deipara*, or *Mother of God*. Wherefore hee was banished into the Ile *Oasis*: where hee died miserably, hauing his accursed tongue eaten out with wormes. But as I say the Church of God hath euer held and defended the contrary, which I proue by vnanswerable reasons. And.

Can. 1. First by generall Councels. In the Councell of *Ephesus* it was thus decreed. *Whosoeuer confesseth not the holy Virgin to bee Genitricem Dei, the Mother of God, let him bee anathema.* The Councell of *Chalcedon* confirmed the
Act. 5. same, ratifying the Acts of the *Ephesine Councell*. And the fift Councell of *Constantinople* thus defines, *If any say the glorious Virgin Mary is not truely but abusiuely Genitrix Dei*, that is, *the Mother of God, let him bee Anathema* or *accursed*.

Secondly, by ancient Fathers both before and since *Nestorius*, who all stile her *Deiparam*, the *Mother of God*. *Origen* largely discourses, and renders many reasons
In ad Rom. why shee should bee so called. *Eusebius Pamphili* saith,
In vita Constantini. that the *Empresse Helena honored Deipara partum, the birth of the Mother of God*. *Cyrill of Alexandria* presi-
In Conc. Eph. dent in the foresaid Councell of *Ephesus* in his *Anathematismes* sent to *Nestorius* saith that *Marie genuit, carnally begat him that was made flesh, euen the Word of God*: and anathematizeth them that deny her to bee *Genitri-*
Epist. 1. ad Chelid. *cem Dei*, the *Mother of God*. *Gregory Nazianzen*, *If any belieue not the Virgin Mary to be Genitricem Dei, the*
Ep. 97. ad Leon. Aug. *Mother of God, let him bee separated from God*. *Leo*, *Accursed bee Nestorius, who belieued not the Blessed Virgin to bee Dei Genitricem, the Mother of God*. *Iohn Cassian*,

It

It is not lawfull to say Christ and not God is borne of Mary. L. 2. de. Incar. *Prosper of Aquitani, The Virgin Mary bare Christ who is God of Heauen. Hesychius, Therefore to note the Natiuity of Christ; the Sacrifice is said to bee baked in an ouen, to wit in the Wombe Genitricis Dei, of the Mother of God.* L. 1. com. in. Lev. 2. *Augustin, Mary therefore begat, and begat not the Sonne of God. She begat him when Christ was borne of her according to the flesh: Shee begat him not when the Sonne without beginning issued from the Father. Vincentius Lirinensis, Anathema to Nestorius denying God to bee borne of the Virgin.* Cont. Faelic. c. 18. Ca 21. Many more Fathers I could easily alledge, but I presume one *Decade* of such witnesses is euidence sufficient.

Thirdly, by latter writers of the reformed Churches, who maintaine the same Faith of the Fathers. *Caluin, We are to abhorre the Heresie of Nestorius*, that was, that *Mary* is not the *Mother of God.* Againe, *Hee that is the Sonne of God, the same is the Sonne of Mary. Beza, The Church hath rightly defined against Nestorius, that Mary should be called* Θεοτοκος, *the Mother of God. Peter Martyr, Wee confesse that the Sonne of God is borne of the Blessed Virgin, neither doubt wee to call Mary* Θεοτοκον, *the Mother of God. Sadeel, Iustly was Nestorius condemned, denying the holy Virgin to bee Deiparam, the Mother of God, seeing our ancestors haue constantly defended that Mary is* Θεοτοκος *the Mother of God, though not the Mother of the Diuinity. Danæus, It is manifest that Mary may and ought to bee called* Θεοτοκος *the Mother of God. Polanus, It is rightly said of Christ that hee is God borne of the Virgin. Bucanus* placeth among doctrines repugnant to diuine truth this of *Nestorius*, that *Mary* is not Θεοτοκος *the Mother of God. Tilenus, The Blessed Virgin is truly called* Θεοτοκος *the* Inst. l. 2. c. 14. §. 4. Referr. Ser. In Luc. 1. 35. Dial. de Corp. Christ. loc. De ver. hum. nat. Christ. In Aug. de hær. c. 91. Part. l. 1. Loco de Christ.

Synt. de Nat. Christ. n. 19. Ser. c. 18. On Creed.

Mother of God. Perkins, *Hence Mary is called* θεοτοκος *the Mother of God though ſhee be not the Mother of the Deity.* And, *Shee muſt bee held to bee the Mother of the whole Chriſt God and Man: and therefore the ancient Church hath called her the Mother of God, yet not the Mother of the Godhead.* Finally the great *Defendor* of the ancient *Catholicke and Apoſtolicke Faith King* IAMES, *I acknowledge her to bee the Mother of God, ſeeing in Ieſus Chriſt the humane nature cannot bee ſeparated from the Deity.*

Præmonit.

Fourthly, by the Creed of the Apoſtles ſo vniuerſally receiued of all Churches: wherein all true Chriſtians profeſſe, that they belieue in Ieſus Chriſt, the onely begotten Sonne of the Father, and that he was *conceiued of the Holy Ghoſt, and borne of the Virgin Mary.* If the eternall ſonne of God were borne of the bleſſed Virgin, then muſt ſhee needs bee the *Mother of God.* The Creed therefore of the Councell of *Chalcedon* thus expoundeth and openeth it, *Borne of the Bleſſed Virgin and* θεοτοκος *Mother of God.*

Neither may wee thinke that the holy Church of *Chriſt* hath vnaduiſedly or raſhly beléeued this doctrine: but vpon firme and vnmoueable grounds both of Scripture and the *analogie of Faith.* For firſt Scripture euidently teacheth it. *That holy thing which ſhall bee borne of thee, ſhall bee called the Sonne of God*, ſaith *the Angell Gabriel: and Elizabeth, whence commeth this that the Mother of my Lord ſhould come to me?* By which place ſaith *Beza*, it is expreſly manifeſt againſt *Neſtorius* that *Mary* is θεοτοκος *the Mother of God.* Againe, if *Mary* bee the *Mother* of *Ieſus Chriſt*, and *Chriſt* be God, it followeth of neceſſity that ſhe muſt be the *Mother of God.* Nay doth

doth not the Prophet directly ſay that *the child borne vnto us is the mighty God?* In a word, it will not I truſt be denied, but that *Mary* is the Mother of him that was Crucified, that died, that *ſhed his bloud*, that was ſeene with the eye, and felt with the hand. But it was the *Lord of glory* that was Crucified, that was obedient to the death, that ſhed his bloud: it was the Lord of life that was both ſeene and felt. And therefore is *Mary* alſo the Mother of the Lord of glory, the Mother of the Lord of life, the Mother of him that is equall with God, and conſequently God, ſeeing none is equall vnto God but God.

Eſa. 9. 6.

1. Cor. 2. 8. Phil. 2. 8. Act. 20. 1. Ioh. 1. 2.

As Scripture, ſo the Analogie of Faith alſo confirmeth it. For no reaſon can be rendred why *Mary* ſhould not be the *Mother of God*, but eyther becauſe Chriſt is not God, or becauſe the humanity was the ſubject of Conception and Birth before it was aſſumpted by the Word, or laſtly becauſe the Humanity was neuer aſſumpted into the Vnity of the ſame Perſon, but remayned a diſtinct perſon by it ſelfe: all which were the damnable blaſphemies and hereſies of *Arius*, *Photinus*, *and Neſtorius*, the firſt of *Arius*, the ſecond of *Photinus*, the third of *Neſtorius*. Therefore contrarywiſe I argue thus, If Chriſt bee God, and the Humanity were at the firſt creation thereof preuented from ſubſiſting in it ſelfe, and neuer had ſubſiſtence but in the Word, ſo as both Natures conſtitute one onely *Hypoſtaſis or Perſon*: certenly there cannot bee two Sonnes, one of God, and another of Mary, but the *Sonne of God* muſt needs be the Sonne of Mary, and ſo Mary be the *Mother of the Sonne of God*. And as by reaſon of this *Hypoſtaticall vnion Chriſt* himſelfe doubted not to ſay, *The Sonne of Man came downe*

downe from heauen: so the same analogie and proportion of Faith requires vs to say, *The Sonne of God is borne of the Virgin Mary*, which as *Vincentius Lirinensis* saith, is most catholickly beleeued, and most impiously denied.

Much more might be added hereunto: but to them that iudge of persons by the Faith this is too much, and enough euen to them that iudge of Faith by Persons. Only from hence I inferre first that *Titius* confounding Papists in open pulpit for calling the blessed Virgin *Deiparam*, *the Mother of God*, either knew not what he said, and so proued himselfe but a nouice in Diuinity: or if hee spake aduisedly and out of iudgement, it was no lesse then professed heresy. Secondly that I disapprouing *Titius* therein, cannot iustly bee taxed of tricks or niceties or *spirit of contradiction*, vnlesse together with mee, *Councels, Fathers, Protestants, the Apostolicall and Chalcedonian Creed, Scripture and the Analogie of Faith*, vndergoe the same censure. Lastly, that as Seneca (otherwise an excellent Moralist) spake very irregularly when hee said *Drunkennes would sooner be commended in Cato, then Cato condemned for his Drunkennes*: so you (though els I perswade my selfe a sound and *Orthodoxe Christian*) much swarued from the rule of Piety and Faith, when you chose rather to excuse *Nestorianisme* in *Titius*, then with me to condemne him for it. And all least some who haue ouer prodigally bestowed transcendent and immoderate prayses vpon him, should seeme eyther too weake in iudgement, or too strong in passion.

M. AN-

M. ANTONIVS MVRETVS his Inſtitution for Children tranſlated.

MY Sonne while you are young
Theſe precepts learne of mee:
Beare them in mind not on your tongue,
And let them practiz'd bee.

Firſt ſee you ſerue and feare
The God of heauen aboue:
Then Parents deere, and ſuch as beare
The roome of Parents loue.

To lie count it great ſhame:
What thereby can you gaine?
If you haue err'd confeſſe the ſame,
So grace you may obtaine.

Seeke learning greedily:
Then learning what more ſweet?
By it you may moſt readily
With wealth and honor meet.

If any ſhall you chide
When you haue faulty been,
Thanke him therefore and then take heed
He chide you not agen.

The man that ſpeakes you faire
Count him not ſtraight your friend:
He hates the child that doth him ſpare
When as he doth offend.

Who once hath you deceiu'd
With flattring words and faine:
He when occaſion is perceiu'd
Will you deceiue againe.

If you be wiſe nor none,
Nor euery one belieue:
You looſe your credit by the one,
Th'other will you deceiue.

If ſin you ſhould commit,
Or in your mind ſhould plot:
God who ſees all things ſeeth it,
Though man perceiue it not.

To none but friends well tride,
Your ſecrecies reueale:
And what you would haue others hide,
Firſt you your ſelfe conceale.

Fixe not your eye on things,
Uncomly to be done:

By

By wanton ſights young tenderlings
Soone take infection.

Refraine and turne your eare
From filthy ribaldrie:
Such as delight therein forbeare
To keepe them company.

Vnpleaſant if the root
Of ſtudie ſeeme to you:
Yet doubtles ſweet & wholeſome fruite
In time from thence will grow.

If you in play delight,
That pleaſure ſoone decayes:
If in your booke, the benefit
Thereof remaines alwayes.

If reſt bee moderate,
Health it and ſtrength doth breed:
But duls the ſpirits and doth rebate
Wits edge if it exceed.

Whiles others good you ſeeke,
Good to your ſelfe you gaine:
Vnleſſe you louing be and meeke,
Loue can you not obtaine.

Wonder not when you ſee,
How wicked men doe thriue:
God will at length reuenged bee,
Though he a while repriue.

If reſt you ſeeke and eaſe,
Spare you no paines in youth:
For after labour quietnes
With dignity inſueth.

Looke often in your glaſſe,
And beauty if you finde,
Beware you doe it not deface
With vices of the minde.

But if therein you ſee,
Your ſelfe deform'd and foule:
Let that defect ſupplied be
With vertues of the ſoule.

Doe not what you would dread
To doe if men did ſee:
And let your ſelfe to you inſteed
Of many a witneſſe be.

To ſhew you much ſhould heare,
And few ſhould be your words:
Nature to you a double eare,
And but one tongue affoords.

Haue care you oft behold,
What you would ſafe ſhould bee:
Theeues ſeldome are with thoſe things bold
Which oft the eye doth ſee.

Slouth fawnes at firſt and fleeres,
But euer ends in ſhame,

Induſtrie

Induſtrie rigorous firſt appeares,
But breeds immortall fame.

Or taſt no wine, or it
With ſtore of water drench:
For youth in wine to take delight
Is fire with fire to quench.

Let your lookes modeſt be,
Your ſpeech courteous and kinde:
So doing ſhall you eaſily
Much loue and frendſhip finde.

In your deſires let not
Wealth more then vertue ſway:
Vertue by wealth cannot be got,
But wealth by vertue may.

What ſo you learne that ſtriue
To hold faſt in your mind:
Elſe draw you water in a ſiue
And vainly beat the wind.

Vndiſcreet anger flee:
Then wrath what fouler vice?
What moues thereto great praiſe will be
To you if you deſpiſe.

Elms high on mountaines plac't
With ſtorms are often beat:
Whoſe fury ſhrubs doe ſeldome taſt
That low in vales are ſet.

So at the great mans gate
Great dangers doe attend:
But euer to the meane eſtate,
The heauens more ſafety ſend.

A few words ſeaſonably
If children ſpeake is fit:
The one doth argue modeſty,
The other argues wit.

The way to honeſt fame,
Would you faine learne of me?
'Tis this, be you in truth the ſame
You would be thought to be.

Who feares his Maſters charge
The rod he needs not feare:
Who that contemnes and runs at large
The ſmart of this muſt beare.

Thrice happy child that growes
In vertue more then yeeres:
Deſerued prayſe each one beſtowes
On him aboue his peers.

On him they look, to him
They wiſh all happines:
But none vouchſafeth ſpeech to them
That ruſt in idlenes.

Them all men doe deſpiſe,
The vulgar them deride:

Their

Their parents ſcarce with patient eyes
Their preſence can abide.

Sin hurts not then alone
When we the ſame commit:
For vſe of ſin makes vs more prone
And apt againe to it.

What ſo is good purſue,
If hard at firſt it ſeeme,
Yet after vſe and practice due,
You eaſie will it deeme.

The good turne you receiue
Extoll you and confeſſe:
What you haue done giue others leaue
To praiſe, make you it leſſe.

When with vtility
Honeſty cannot ſtand:
You may not doubt but honeſty
Muſt haue the vpperhand.

And thus to you my child
Theſe few rules I commend:
Which well obſeru'd ſtrange fruite will yeeld
Vnto you in the end.

Meane while that God aboue
Whoſe mighty word and will
What euer is doth rule and moue
Bleſſe your endeuours ſtill.

Whom

Whom early in the morne
When you your bed forſake,
And late at night when you returne
Sweet ſleep againe to take.

Meekly vpon your knee
With humble vowes attend:
So pregnancy of wit will he
And health of body ſend.

Yea better things then theſe
Will he vnto you ſpare:
Only refer all to his praiſe
Both what you haue and are.

To my Daughter E. D, Written on her Bible.

Sith you my child the child of wrath were borne,
From ſinful fleſh deriuing ſinfull ſtaine:
Into Gods fauour can you not returne,
If of the ſpirit you be not borne againe.

None are new borne but of immortall ſeed:
That ſeed immortall is this word of truth.
By it next vnder God I truſt to breed,
Your ſecond birth who bred your former ruth.

This will in you ſubdue each ſinfull luſt,
Your mind enlighten, and your hart create

Pious

Pious to God, towards your neighbour iuſt
And to your ſelfe ſober and temperate.

This ſeaſon will your greener yeares with grace:
And crowne your head when you haue run your race.

A Prayer.

MY ſins o Lord haue me unworthy made
To licke the crums that from thy table fall;
My guilty ſoule dares not for comfort call,
That Now through famiſhment my ſtrength doth fade:
But thou dear Lord that vaild in mortall fleſh
For mans offence on bitter croſſe didſt bleed:
With bread of life my ſtarued ſoule refreſh.

My ſoule doth thirſt like to the parched ground,
And humors moiſt are turnd to ſummers drought:
Thy burning wrath this inward heat hath wrought,
And feare of Hell my conſcience doth confound.
But lord thou art an euerlaſting well,
Whence pureſt ſtreames of liuing waters flow:
O quench the flames wherein my hart doth glow,
And on thy banks let me for euer dwell.

Through ſtranger countries harborles I ſtray,
From *Paradiſe* exild, my natiue land:
And angrie *Cherubin* with burning brand
Of my returne doth intercept the way.
Thou art the way ſweet *Ieſu* thou the dore,
Yet harborles waſt in a manger borne:
O let my ſoule faint, weary, and forlorne,

By thée reenter, then retire no more.

Ah who is me, for opened are mine eyes,
And now with ſhame my naked ſhame I ſee:
My ſoule abaſht faine would thy preſence flee
And ſory figleaues to her ſhame applies.
But Lord thy wardrobes ſtore can nere be ſpent,
And whiteſt rayment thou doeſt ſell for nought:
O let the robe of iuſtice foorth be brought,
Therwith t'inueſt this thriftles penitent.

My ſoule, o Lord, is fild with ſtrange diſeaſe,
And cruell theeues haue wounded me ſo ſore,
That nought but wound I am and bloudy gore,
And on my life eternall death doth ſeize.
But Lord thou art that good *Samaritan*,
The skilfulſt leach to ſalue a wounded hart:
O let thy precious balms ſoone eaſe my ſmart,
And dying ſoule preſerue from endles bane.

In deepeſt dongeon comfortles I lie,
Ne of my debt can pay the lighteſt graine:
My Iailour *Satan* is, my ſin the Chaine,
And bound with ſin who can the bonds vnty.
But thou deare Lord haſt broke the gates of Hel,
And with thy deareſt bloud our debts doeſt pay:
O cancel thou my bonds my debts defray,
And from my hart all ſeruile feare expell.

Pinde, thirſtie, exild, naked, ſick, in iaile,
Feed, quench, returne, coner, reconer, baile.

A Hymne vnto Christ.

LVte awake,
Why sleepest thou so long?
Come let vs musick make,
And chant some holy song.
My heart and voice shall with thy strings accord,
To sing the prayse of Christ my King and Lord.

Brightest beame,
Of brightest glory bred:
The euerlasting streame,
From purest fountaine shed.
The light, the life, true God, chiefe good thou art:
And of thy good to each wight doest impart.

Then thou wast
When time was not begun,
Without thee nothing past,
By thee all things were done.
The earth, the sea, the aire, the heauens abone,
By thee doth stand, doth flow, doth breath, doe moue.

God thou art,
Yet didst our nature take,
Enduring bitter smart,
A peace for vs to make.
Thy Crosse, thy Wounds, thy Blood, thy Death, thy
Our sinfull soules from endlesse death doe saue.

Glorifide
Thou now in heauen doeſt raigne,
And for thy Saints prouide
A place there to remaine,
Where King is three in one, and one in three,
Law perfect loue, and tearme eternity.

Lachryma.

IF by ſighs, or teares, or cries,
I could diſcharge the weight of griefe,
Which on my ſoule ſo heauy lies,
Soone would I find releefe.
My ſad heart would vapour ſighs,
Mine eyes would ſtreame foorth flouds of teares,
My voice with ſhrikes and dolefull cries
Would vent mine inward feares.
But my ſoule too deep is wounded,
Nor can my troubled ſprite
By ſighs, or teares, or cries be lightened
Of thoſe ſorrowes me affright.
Shallow are thoſe foords that murmure,
Sleight ſorrowes ſoone complaine:
My heart, mine eyes, my voice aſtonied are
With extreame diſeaſe and paine.
Thus my woes emprizned in my breaſt
Still on me tyrannize:
Happy, happy whoſe cares are bleſt
With ſighs, with teares, with cryes.

Once

Once deare Lord vnworthy mee
With gracious eyes thou didſt reſpect:
Thou ſhewdſt me ioyes that none can ſee
But Saints in Chriſt elect.
Now alas why doeſt thou frowne?
Why doeſt thou gnaſh thy teeth at me?
From higheſt bliſſe why am I throwne
To loweſt miſery.
Shall thy wrath exceed thy mercy?
Can pitie cruell proue?
Shall death and hell, and flames that neuer die
Seize whom thou ſometime didſt loue?
Ah ſweet Ieſu bee my Ieſu,
Though ſin my ſoule haue ſtaine,
Thy wine, thy oile, thy balme may life renue,
And cloſe vp my wounds againe.
Why then am I with deſpaire poſſeſt
Sith hope and grace I ſee?
Kill me; kill me yet will I reſt
My ſtedfaſt faith on thee.

The Spouſe of Chriſt longing for, and reioycing in her marriage with him.

COme returne, haſt away,
O thou whom my ſoule doth loue:
Lo thy ſpouſe night and day
Longs to reſt with thee aboue,
While thou tarieſt all too long,

Cruell tyrants me oppreſſe,
And triumph in my ſad diſtreſſe:
Come therefore auenge my wrong,
Eaſe my hart brimfull of greefe,
O haſt thee Lord and bring releefe.

Welcome ioy, farwell woe
Hither lo he ſpeeds a maine,
Swift as hart, ſwift as roe,
Skipping high on *Bethers* plaine.
Nightly ſhades are fled and gone,
And now dawnes that bleſſed day,
That weds me to my loue for aye.
Now my foes lament and mone,
Iuſtly doomd to darkeſt Hell,
But I with Chriſt in heauen ſhall dwell.

An Euening Prayer.

O Holy and eternall light
Defend vs now this darkſome night:
Grant inward peace to troubled heart,
To wearied ſenſe ſweet ſleep impart.
Whilſt heauy eyes ſleeps comfort take,
O let our ſoules ſtill on thee wake.

Let thy right hand keep and protect
From ſleep of ſin thy Saints elect.
When ſleep of death ſhall cloſe our eyes,
O let our ſoules aſcend the skies.

Meane while fraile fleſh ſhall reſt from ſtrife,
Till death bee ſwallowed vp of life.

A Soule diſtracted betweene Hope and Feare.

HAte I deſerue and yet for loue I ſue,
I beg for life and yet death is my due
Worthy I am that thou ſhouldſt me reiect,
And yet I claime the crowne of thine elect.

Alas how may ſo bold a ſute be heard?
And ſinfull wretch obtaine a Saints reward?
Nay ſhall I not thy kindled wrath inflame
Crauing all good, deſeruing nought but ſhame?

Sin bids me feare, yet ſtill I hope for grace;
Grace bids me hope, yet ſtill I feare diſgrace:
While feare doth hope and hope doth feare reſtraine
'Twixt feare and hope my heart is rent in twaine.

Wilt thou ſweet Ieſus plead my cauſe for me?
Alas my bare eſtate affoords no fee:
Yet if in forme of poore to thee I flie,
Thy word is paſt thou canſt me not deny.

Thee then mine aduocate I entertaine,
By thee an eaſy ſute I ſhall obtaine:
So double comfort ſhall my heart enioy
Of preſent grace and hope of future ioy.

Hope

Hope of Pardon.

SHould I O Lord excuſe or cloake my ſin?
Are thine eyes ſo dim that thou canſt not ſee?
Can guilty ſoule thy gracious fauour win?
Or by righteous doome iuſt reputed be?
Thy cryſtall eyes my ſecret thoughts behold,
Yea thou knowſt them long ere they be conceiued:
Thou art not man to be corrupt with gold,
Nor by vaine excuſe canſt thou be deceiued. A
Yet will I not deſpaire to gaine
Pardon for my great offences,
Though iuſtice doome eternall paine,
With iuſtice mercy ſtill diſpences.

When ſhall I then to thoſe high ioyes aſpire
Which in heauen aboue thou reſeruſt for me?
Mount vp my ſoule with wings of high deſire,
Till thou heauen enioy what ioy can there be.
On barren earth ſin is the ſeed we ſow,
And the crop we reape is but ſorrowes gaine:
And if ſometime from ſin ſhort pleaſures grow,
Sinfull pleaſures end in the eternall paine.
Then ſith on earth we reape no graine
But ſhort ioyes long ſorrowes bringing:
O let me liue where Angels raigne,
Their endles *Alleluiah* ſinging.

The Epicure and Christian.

Time doth haſte,
Life as a ſhadow flies:
Breath as a vapor ſoone doth waſt,
And none returns that dies,
Come let vs baniſh woes,
And liue while life doth laſt:
Crowne we our heads with budding roſe
And of each pleaſure taſt.
What though preciſe fooles do vs blame
Shall wee forgoe content?
Pleaſure is ſubſtance, vertue name,
And life will ſoone be ſpent.

Time ſhall ceaſe,
Archangels tromp ſhall ſing:
Death ſhall his priſoners all releaſe,
And them to iudgement bring.
Then ſhall theſe ſinfull ioyes
To endles wayling turne:
And they that ſcorned vertues choice
In brimſtone flames ſhall burne.
Then they that erſt fond *Stoicks*
Shall wiſedomes children proue:
When they among the Saints eſteemed
Shall raigne with Chriſt aboue.

A Sinners appeale from Iustice to Mercy.

AY me, from me my wonted ioyes are fled,
And saddest greefe on my poore hart hath seazd:
Thy mortall sting ô sin this wo hath bred,
And dreadfull wrath of my deare Lord displeasd.
I see his sword vpreard me to confound,
And guilty soule attends her deadly wound.

Oh then my soule where canst thou rest secure?
Where wilt thou flie from his reuenging ire?
If vp heauen, there enters nought impure,
If downe to hell, there flames eternall fire.
Nor deepest sea, nor shade of darkest night
Can secret thee from his al seeing sight.

Yet from thy selfe thy selfe a refuge art:
When from thy iustice to thy grace we flie:
O gracious Lord to thee my pensiue heart
With teares of true remorse for grace doth crie.
Thy mercy Lord my soule from death may saue:
O rid my dying soule from lowest graue.

A Caroll for the Nativity.

A Wonder strange this day was wrought;
Exceeding mans and Angels thought:
Though domb haue spoke, and blind haue seene,
And they reuiu'd who dead haue beene,

Yet

Yet neuer vertue like to this
Whereby was wrought mans endleſſe bliſſe.

Behold then and amazed ſtand,
This is the finger of Gods hand:
A virgin pure without mans aide,
Hath borne a child yet ſtill a maide:
Which babe this day began to be,
Yet was from all eternity.

A King of Kings, and yet a thrall,
Poſſeſſing nought, yet Lord of all:
Creator, yet a creature,
Light of the world, and yet obſcure:
Moſt beauteous, and yet without forme,
Ador'd of Angels, yet a worme.

Omnipotent, yet fraile and weake,
Th' eternall Word, yet could not ſpeake:
Moſt quiet calme, yet without reſt,
The food of Saints, yet ſuckt the breſt,
Embracing all, yet but a ſpan,
Inmortall life, yet mortall man.

Man, yet in God ſubſiſting aye,
God, yet confined to caſe of clay:
Both God and man 'twixt both to treat,
And firmeſt league 'twixt them to ſet:
That mercy might with iuſtice meet,
And peace and truth each other greet.

O blessed dame whose lips might kisse,
whose paps did nurse this babe of blisse:
O blessed babe whose ioyfull birth,
Hath chang'd our sighs to tunes of mirth:
Who now thy sweets may taste and proue,
By faith on earth, in heauen by loue.

Christ comforting a distressed soule.

SIgh no more soule, oh sigh no more,
Despaire not thou thus euer,
Thy God hath grace for thee in store,
His mercy faileth neuer.
Then sigh not so,
Let sorrowes go,
Sing in the highest Hosanna,
And change thy dolefull sounds of woe
Into Halleluiah.

Manifold are thy sins I know,
And deep in crimson died,
Yet whiter shalt thou bee then snow,
In my blood purified.
Then sigh not so, &c.

Heauen against thee shut by sin,
Haue I for thee vnlocked,
Since thou so kindly let me in,
When at thy heart I knocked,
Then sigh not so, &c.

Come

Come to me, lo thy Sauiour cryes,
Thou canst not be refused,
For neuer did I yet despise
A broken heart and bruised.
Then sigh not so, &c.

There in peace shalt thou liue and raigne,
And neuer more be sory,
Aboue the measure of thy paine
Shall bee thy weight of glory.
Then sigh not so,
Let sorrowes go,
Sing in the highest Hosanna,
And change thy dolefull sounds of woe
Into Halleluiah.

THE FIRST PSALME.

BLessed yea thrice blest are they
That lewd counsels haue not traced:
Nor haue stood in sinners way,
Nor in scorners chaire are placed.
But in Gods lawes they delight,
Them they study day and night.

These like trees stand euermore
By the riuers freshly springing:
Pleasant fruit in plenteous store

Duly in their ſeaſon bringing.
Neuer ſhall their leafe decay,
What they doe ſhall proſper aye.

But the wicked are like duſt
To and fro with tempeſt driuen:
Neither ſhall they with the iuſt
Stand when iudgement ſhall be giuen.
For God knowes the iuſt mans way,
And them ſtroyes that from him ſtray.

Pſalme. 12.

SIth on earth all friends doe faile,
Prouing faythleſſe and vnkind,
Sith now euery where preuaile
Flattring lips and double mind,
Lord ſend help from heauen aboue,
Who alone art perfect loue.

But theſe falſe diſſembling tongues
God eftſoones will root them out;
Thoſe that triumph in their wronge,
Vttering proud words and ſtout,
Who ſhall curb our tongues ſay they,
Ours they are and they ſhall ſway.

For when once the poore doth crie,
And to God his vowes addreſſe:
Now, ſaith God, ariſe will I,
Him to ſaue, them to repreſſe.

God

God whoſe word is ſiluer tride,
And in ſeuen fires puri fide.

Lord performe as thou haſt ſaid,
Saue and keep thine heritage:
Help the poore ſo much diſmaid
From this lewd and ſinfull age,
Which baſe men doth higheſt raiſe,
And to vice giues vertues praiſe.

Pſalme. 13.

LOrd how long wilt thou delay?
Shall I neuer comfort find?
Can thine endleſſe grace decay?
Or thy kindneſſe proue vnkind?
Why then hideſt thou thy face,
Careleſſe of my care and griefe?
Why withholdeſt thou thy grace,
And denieſt me due reliefe?
Shall my fruitleſſe counſels ſtill
Thus torment my troubled ſprite?
Shall my foes triumph at will,
While thy terrors me affright?

Heare O Lord behold my plight,
Speedy help of thee I craue:
Light my dim decayed ſight,
That I ſleep not in the graue.
Leſt my foes with proud diſdaine
Boaſt as if they did preuaile:

Ioying

Ioying in my ſaddeſt paine,
When my feeble ſteps doe faile.
But I ioy and hope alwayes
On thy grace and ſauing health,
And my heart ſhall ſing thee praiſe,
Th' only worker of my wealth.

Pſalme. 23.

HOw can I lacke what may content,
My boundleſſe greedy heart?
Sith thou O Al-ſufficient
My carefull ſhepheard art.
When I on tender graſſe haue fed
Thou foldſt me ſafe and ſure:
And when I thirſt thou doeſt me lead
To ſtreames Chryſtalline pure.

Thou doeſt my wandring ſoule reclaime
When from thee I doe ſtray:
And thou my ſteps euen for thy name
Doeſt guide in righteous way.
Were I to paſſe through ſhade of death
No danger would I feare:
Thy rod thy crooke me comforteth,
Thy help is alwayes neere.

Thou haſt a plenteous table ſpred
For me before my foe:
With pretious balme thou dew'ſt my head,

My

My bowle doth ouerflow.
And while I liue thy bounteous grace
Shall neuer me forſake:
But euer in thy dwelling place
Will I my dwelling make.

Pſalme. 119. Beth.

HOw ſhall a young man prone to ill
Clenſe his vnruly and vnbridled way?
If that he learne to know thy will,
And from thy ſacred lawes goe not aſtray.
Thee haue I ſought with perfect heart
In whom doth reſt my full contente:
O let me neuer from thee part,
Nor erre from thy commandements.
Thy words deep in my heart are hid,
That from thy precepts I may neuer ſwerue:
O gracious Lord as thou haſt bid
Teach me thy Precepts euer to obſeruc.

Thy righteous iudgements and thy wayes
which of thy grace to me thou doeſt bewray.
My lips created for thy praiſe
Shall neuer ceaſe to publiſh night nor day.
My hearts deſire and whole delight
Vpon thy ſtatutes fixed are:
No worldly treaſure in my ſight
May with thy precepts once compare.
As on the lodeſtar of my life
So on thy lawes my ſtedfaſt eyes are fixt:

And in my thoughts they are so rife
That I thy precepts neuer can forget.

Psalme. 125.

THey whose hopes are mounted high,
Rais'd with wings of faith and loue,
Stormie tempest, thundring skie,
Trembling earth can neuer moue.
They though hell against them band,
Stedfast like *Mount Sion* stand.

As about *Ierusalem*
Mighty hils aduanced are:
So doth God inuiron them
That on him rely their care.
He from danger doth protect
And secure his Saints elect.

Though a while fierce tyrants prey
On Christs flocke with furious rage,
Their proud scepter shall not sway
Alwayes on his heritage:
Lest forlorne and in contempt,
Sinfull counsels they attempt.

Lord let them thy bounty taste
That are pure and poore in sprite
Whose wrie steps wrie paths haue trac't
Range them with the hypocrite:
That the chaffe purg'd from the graine
Israel may in peace remaine.

Psalme.

Psalme. 130.

OVt of the deep O Lord, to thee I crie,
Giue eare and heare the voice of my complaint:
If thou seuerely marke iniquity,
Who can be cleere and free from sinfull taint?
But mercy Lord with thee remaines in store,
That men may feare thee and thy name adore.

On thee I wait and on thy righteous word,
More then the morning watch for dawning day.
Let *Israel* likewise trust in the Lord,
With him redemption and much grace doth sway.
And though his sins in number passe the sand:
He shall redeeme him with his mighty hand.

Psalme. 131.

LOrd thou know'st who hast me tride,
That my heart swels not with pride:
I looke not high, nor doe I stretch
My thoughts too far beyond my reach.

Haue I not like weaned child
Euermore beene meeke and mild?
Yea sure I haue my selfe demean'd
Like infant from his mother wean'd.

Israel doe thou likewise,
Learne in meeke and humble guise

Like

Like babe new weaned from the breſt
Still on thy God thy hopes to reſt.

Pſalme. 133.

O Come behold what thing it is,
How good, how ſweet, how full of bliſſe,
When diſcords and diſſenſions ceaſe,
And brethren loue and liue in peace.

Much like the pretious oyle that's ſhed
Vpon the high Prieſts ſacred head:
Which dewes his beard and thence doth raigne
Downe on his holy veſtments traine.

Much like the pleaſant morning dewes
Which *Hermons* fertile top renewes:
Or that which fals on *Sions* hill,
And doth her horne with plenty fill.

O bleſſed they that can agree
To dwell in peace and vnity:
For there the Lord giues euermore
Both happy life and plenteous ſtore.

FINIS.